This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

KF 20837

2/3

THE WORKS OF

RICHARD BENTLEY, D.D.

COLLECTED AND EDITED

BY THE REV. ALEXANDER DYCE.

VOL. I.

DISSERTATION UPON THE EPISTLES OF PHALARIS.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY ROBSON, LEVEY, AND FRANKLYN,
46 St. Martin's Lane.

DISSERTATIONS UPON
THE EPISTLES OF PHALARIS,

THEMISTOCLES, SOCRATES, EURIPIDES,

AND UPON

THE FABLES OF ÆSOP:

ALSO,

EPISTOLA AD JOANNEM MILLIUM.

BY RICHARD BENTLEY, D.D.

EDITED, WITH NOTES,

BY THE REV. ALEXANDER DYCE.

LONDON:

FRANCIS MACPHERSON,

MIDDLE ROW, HOLBORN.

1836.

KF 20837

51 x 112

THE

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

In the arrangement of the pieces contained in these two volumes, I have given precedence to the enlarged *Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris,* 1699. Next follows the Appendix which Bentley furnished to the second edition of Wotton's *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning,* 1697, and which consists of *A Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris, Themistocles, Socrates, Euripides, and upon Æsop's Fables.* The last place is occupied by the *Epistola ad Joannem Millium,* from the edition subjoined to the *Historia Chronica* of Malelas, 1691, collated with the impression annexed to the *Emendationes in Menandri et Philemonis Reliquias,* 1713.

I originally intended, in reprinting the Appendix to Wotton's *Reflections,* to omit the Essay on Phalaris; but it has been retained at the suggestion of several eminent scholars, who thought a republication of it desirable, on account of the entire dissection and occasional alteration which it underwent in the edition of 1699.

The Notes which I have inserted are placed between brackets, and marked by the letter D: among these will be found the most important of Dr. Salter's contributions to the reprint of the enlarged *Dissertation* in 1777; an edition which has

his duty as the King's Librarian, are plainly proved in the Preface to the enlarged *Dissertation.** At Christ Church, however, credit was given to Bennet's assertions, that Bentley, after long solicitation, having put the MS. into his hands, had almost immediately recalled it, before the collation could be completed, and had "thrown out several slight and disparaging expressions"† both about Boyle and his work. When, therefore, the edition was published in 1695, it contained the following announcement: "*Epistolas . . . . collatas etiam curavi usque ad Epist.* 40. *cum MS° in Bibliotheca Regia, cujus mihi copiam ulteriorem Bibliothecarius pro singulari sua humanitate negavit.*"‡ Soon after the appearance of the work, a copy of it having fallen under Bentley's eye, he instantly addressed a letter to the editor, explaining the real state of the case. He expected that the offensive leaf would be cancelled; but the impression was already delivered to the booksellers.|| Boyle coldly replied, that his explanation came too late, and that he might seek redress in any way he pleased.

In 1694, while the first edition of Wotton's *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* was in the press, Bentley had undertaken to furnish it with a Dissertation, demonstrating the spuriousness of Phalaris's Epistles and Æsop's Fables. Circumstances at that time occurred to prevent the performance of his engagement; but now that a new

* See vol. i. p. vii, &c. and Dr. Monk's *Life of Bentley*, vol. i. p. 65, &c.

† Boyle's *Examination*, p. 3.

‡ *Præf. ad Phal. Epist.*

|| Bentley says, that the Phalaris, when he first saw a copy of it, was not published, and that Boyle answered his letter "after a delay of two posts, on

edition of the *Reflections* was called for, the essay was claimed by Wotton. As it must necessarily include a notice of the Oxford Phalaris, and the treatment he had received from the editor, Bentley desired to be excused from the task. Wotton, however, held him to his promise; and *A Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris, Themistocles, Socrates, Euripides, &c. and Æsop's Fables,* was annexed to the second edition of the *Reflections,* in 1697.*

This merciless attack on the admired Epistles and on Boyle's edition, was regarded at Christ Church as an insult to the society; and they immediately united their whole talent and learning for the production of a book which was intended to destroy at once and for ever the fame and character of Bentley. It was published in 1698, and entitled *Dr. Bentley's Dissertations on the Epistles of Phalaris, and the Fables of Æsop, Examin'd by the Honourable Charles Boyle, Esq.* But little of it seems to have been written by the gentleman in whose name it was sent forth: the greater portion of it was certainly from Atterbury's pen; and Smalridge, John Freind, Robert Freind, and Anthony Alsop, are named as the other contributors. This tissue of superficial learning, ingenious

purpose, as one may justly suspect, that the book might be vended (as it was) and spread abroad in the mean time:" see vol. i. p. iii. From a statement, however, in the *Appendix* to *A Short Account of Dr. Bentley's Humanity and Justice,* &c. p. 121-2, it is evident that before Bentley wrote the letter in question, the book had really been published.

* Dr. Monk well observes, "It cannot, however, be supposed that Bentley's consent was very reluctant, or that he did not secretly rejoice in this fair opportunity of clearing himself from an unpleasant imputation."—*Life of Bentley,* vol. i. p. 78.

sophistry, dexterous malice, and happy raillery, immediately reached a second edition.

The public, who had eagerly watched the progress of the controversy, imagined that it was now ended, and that Bentley was driven with disgrace from the field. At length, in 1699, his immortal work appeared: *A Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris: with an Answer to the Objections of the Honourable Charles Boyle, Esq.* His victory was complete. To such a volume, though his adversaries uttered an empty threat of refutation,* no answer could be given.

On this memorable performance criticism has been exhausted. In the just arrangement of the matter, in the logical precision of the arguments, and in the readiness and skill with which the most extensive and refined erudition is brought to bear upon the points contested, it is perhaps unrivalled by any single work. Enriched with incidental disquisitions on many different topics of classical learning, it will ever be prized by the student as a store-house of important information. It is animated by a vein of genuine humour; and its diction is always sinewy, though sometimes homely, and sometimes pedantic.

In the preceding sketch, I have not mentioned a variety of publications called forth by, or connected with, the war between Bentley and Boyle;

* "And now," says Bennet, "I have done with the Dr., who is much mistaken, however, if he thinks that this is all that will be said to him: for I am allowed to tell the Reader that his last Book will be thoroughly consider'd, both as to the *Matters of Fact* and the *Criticisms*." *Appendix* to *A Short Account of Dr. Bentley's Humanity and Justice, &c.* p. 133.

but they are all enumerated in the subjoined chronological list, which exhibits a view of the Phalaris Controversy from its commencement to its close.

1. *Miscellanea. The Second Part. In Four Essays.* I. *Upon Ancient and Modern Learning.* II. *Upon the Gardens of Epicurus.* III. *Upon Heroick Vertue.* IV. *Upon Poetry. By Sir William Temple, Baronet.—Juvat antiquos accedere Fontes. The Second Edition.* London, 1690. 8vo. pp. 341.

I have not met with any earlier impression of this Miscellany.—In the *Essay upon Ancient and Modern Learning*, p. 60, occurs the extravagant passage about the antiquity and excellence of Æsop's *Fables* and Phalaris's *Epistles*: see it quoted by Bentley, vol. ii. p. 133 of the present work.

2. *ΦΑΛΑΡΙΔΟΣ ΑΚΡΑΓΑΝΤΙΝΩΝ ΤΥΡΑΝΝΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΑΙ. Phalaridis Agrigentinorum Tyranni Epistolæ. Ex MSS. recensuit, Versione, Annotationibus, et Vita insuper Authoris donavit Car. Boyle, ex Æde Christi. Εκ Θεατρου ἐν Οξονια, Ετει ᾳχϟε.* [1695.] 8vo. pp. 156, not including Dedicatio, Præfatio, Vita, Index, &c.

In editing this volume Boyle was assisted by John Freind. It was reprinted in 1718.

3. *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning. By William Wotton, B.D. Chaplain to the Right Honourable the Earl of Nottingham. The Second Edition, with Large Additions. With a Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris, Themistocles, Socrates, Euripides, &c. and Æsop's Fables. By Dr. Bentley.* London, 1697. 8vo. pp. 421 by Wotton, not including Preface, &c., and pp. 152 by Bentley.

On the title-page, immediately before his *Dissertation* (which was sold separately to the purchasers of the first ed. of the *Reflections*), Bentley is styled *D.D. Chaplain in Ordinary and Library-keeper to his Majesty.*—Wotton's work was originally published in 1694: the third edition came forth in 1705, when that part of Bentley's *Dissertation* which relates to Phalaris was omitted, in consequence of the appearance of his enlarged essay in 1699.

4. *Fabularum Æsopicarum Delectus. Oxoniæ, e Theatro Sheldoniano, An. Dom.* MDCXCVIII. 8vo. pp. 128, not including Dedicatio, Præfatio, Testimonia, and Indices.

One of the Christ Church publications, under the auspices of Dr. Aldrich. It was edited by Anthony Alsop, who, in the Preface, sneers at Bentley, (—" quendam Bentleium virum in volvendis Lexicis satis diligentem"—); and in the concluding Fable, *Canis in Præsepi*, alludes to his refusal of the MS. to Boyle. It formed a sort of prelude to the piece next mentioned.

5. *Dr. Bentley's Dissertations on the Epistles of Phalaris, and the Fables of Æsop, Examin'd by the Honourable Charles Boyle, Esq.*

——— *Remember Milo's End,*
Wedg'd in that Timber, which he strove to rend.
Roscomm. Ess. of Transl. Vers.

London, 1698. 8vo. pp. 290, not including Preface.

A second edition appeared during the same year, with a Letter from Boyle to Bennet the bookseller, (occupying one page), prefixed to it, and " A Short Account of Dr. Bentley by way of Index," (filling two leaves at the end), under such heads as, " Dr. Bentley's civil usage of Mr. Boyle,"—" his Singular Humanity to,"—" his elegant similies,"—" his clean and gentile metaphors,"—" his respect to the Bible,"—" his modesty and decency in contradicting great men," &c. &c. A third edition, *with some Additions occasioned by a Book entituled a View of the Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris*, &c. came forth in 1699: these " Additions" are contained in the last two leaves. A fourth edition was printed in 1745. This volume was the production of the associated wits of Christ Church. Boyle seems to have contributed little to it. Atterbury " laid the design of the book, and wrote above half of it:" see his *Epistolary Correspondence*, vol. ii. p. 21. To Smalridge is ascribed the series of arguments proving Bentley, on his own principles, not the author of his own book: and Robert Freind, John Freind, and Anthony Alsop, are supposed to have been the other writers.

6. *A View of the Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris, Themistocles, &c. Lately Publish'd by the Reverend Dr. Bentley. Also of the Examination of that Dissertation by the Honourable Mr. Boyle. In order to the Manifesting the Incertitude of Heathen Chronology.* Ἐγὼ δὲ λόγον ἔνδοξον οὕτω οὔ μοι δοκῶ προήσεσθαι, χρονικοῖς τισι λεγομένοις

κανόσιν, οὓς μυρίοι διορθοῦντες ἄχρι σήμερον εἰς οὐδὲν αὐτοῖς, ὁμολογούμενον δύνανται καταστῆσαι τὰς ἀντιλογίας. Plutarch in Vit. Solon.—London, 1698. 8vo. pp. 78, not including Preface.

Written by John Milner, a man of no ordinary learning, and author of various publications. He was Vicar of Leeds and Prebendary of Ripon; but when the Revolution took place, having lost his preferments for nonjurancy, he retired to St. John's College, Cambridge, where he continued till his death in 1702.

7. *A Free but Modest Censure on the late Controversial Writings and Debates*

Of { *The Lord Bishop of Worcester and Mr. Locke:*
Mr. Edwards and Mr. Locke:
The Honble Charles Boyle, Esq. and Dr. Bentley.

Together with Brief Remarks on Monsieur Le Clerc's Ars Critica. By F. B., M.A. of Cambridg. London, 1698. 4to. pp. 31.

8. *Examen Poeticum Duplex, &c.* Oxon. 1698.

A collection of Latin verses, which I have not seen. It is thus mentioned by Rymer in his *Essay*, &c. p. 69 (vide the next article): "I find in another book published last week, called *Examen Poeticum Duplex*, &c., that he [Dr. Aldrich] has suffered some of his college to make sport with him [Bentley] in their occasional compositions. Amongst other things, somebody has endeavoured his character in two Epigrams. . . . . I am assured they were made in Christ Church, and either by the Dean himself, or a brother Doctor at least." One of the pieces in question was entitled *Intellectus agens illuminat phantasmata, Ad R. B. Bibliothecarium philocriticum*, the other, *Articuli Pacis.*

9. *An Essay concerning Critical and Curious Learning: In which are contained some Short Reflections on the Controversie betwixt Sir William Temple and Mr. Wotton; and that betwixt Dr. Bentley and Mr. Boyl. By T. R., Esq.* London, 1698. 12mo. pp. 77.

Thomas Rymer, the author of this tract, was well known at the time by his critical essays, *The Tragedies of the last Age considered*, &c., and *A Short View of Tragedy*; but is now remembered only as the compiler of the *Fœdera.*

10. *An Answer to a late Pamphlet called an Essay concerning Critical and Curious Learning.* London, 1698. 8vo.

This piece I have not seen. It was written by some member of Christ Church, Rymer having severely censured that society: vide Dr. Monk's *Life of Bentley*, vol. i. p. 114.

11. *A Vindication of an Essay concerning Critical and Curious Learning: in which are contained some short Reflections on the Controversie betwixt Sir William Temple and Mr. Wotton; and that betwixt Dr. Bentley and Mr. Boyl. In Answer to an Oxford Pamphlet. By the Author of that Essay.* [Rymer].

Pudet hæc opprobria nobis
Et dici potuisse et non potuisse refelli.

London, 1698. 12mo. pp. 54.

12. *A Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris. With An Answer to the Objections of the Honourable Charles Boyle, Esquire. By Richard Bentley, D.D. Chaplain in Ordinary and Library-keeper to His Majesty.* London, 1699. 8vo. pp. CXII. of Preface, pp. 549 [545] of Dissertation, not including Index.

On the reverse of the title-page—

Mordear OPPROBRIIS FALSIS, *mutemque Colores?*
FALSUS HONOR *juvat,* & MENDAX INFAMIA *terret*
Quem, nisi MENDACEM & MENDOSUM?

Horat. Epist. I. 16.

It is unnecessary for me to point out in what respects this great work differs from the original *Dissertation*, as both are now presented to the reader. A very incorrect edition, including the *Dissertations on the Epistles of Themistocles, Socrates, Euripides, and Æsop's Fables*, from the first essay, and with notes by Dr. Salter, appeared in 1777, 8vo. The work of 1699 was reprinted in 1816, 8vo; and Salter's edition in 1817, 8vo.

Lennep's masterly translation is entitled, *Richardi Bentleii Dissertatio de Phalaridis, Themistoclis, Socratis, Euripidis, aliorumque Epistolis, et de Fabulis Æsopi. Nec non ejusdem Responsio, qua Dissertationem de Epistolis Phalaridis vindicat a censura Caroli Boyle. Omnia ex Anglico in Latinum sermonem convertit Joannes Daniel a Lennep, Groningæ*, 1777, 4to. This version, and the *Epistola ad Millium*, make up the volume called *Richardi Bentleii Opuscula Philologica, Lipsiæ*, 1781, 8vo.

13. *The Epistles of Phalaris. Translated into English from the Original Greek by J. S. Together with an Appendix of some other Epistles lately discovered in a French MS.* London, 1699. 8vo. pp. 223, not including Preface, &c.

I have not met with the following work; but, from a minute account of it with which I have been favoured by the Rev. B. H. Kennedy, it appears to be either a different edition of the volume just noticed, or the same edition with a new title-page and a few additions:

The Epistles of Phalaris Translated into English from the Original Greek. By S. Whately, late of Magdalen Colledge in Oxford, M.A. To which is added Sir W. Temple's Character of the Epistles of Phalaris. Together with an Appendix of some other Epistles lately Discovered in a French MS. London, 1699. 8vo. pp. 223.

14. *A Short Account of Dr. Bentley's Humanity and Justice to those Authors who have written before him: With an Honest Vindication of Tho. Stanley, Esquire, and his Notes on Callimachus. To which are added, Some other Observations on that Poet. In a Letter to the Honourable Charles Boyle, Esq.; With a Postscript, in Relation to Dr. Bentley's late Book against him. To which is added an Appendix, by the Bookseller* [*Bennet*], *wherein the Doctor's Mis-Representations of all the Matters of Fact wherein he is concern'd, in his late Book about Phalaris's Epistles, are modestly consider'd; with a Letter from the Honourable Charles Boyle, Esq. on that Subject.*

——— quum repetitum venerit unà
Grex avium plumas, risum Cornicla movebit,
Furtivis nudata Coloribus ———

When all the Birds shall claim their own,
And every borrow'd Feather's flown,
How mean the Jackdaw looks, for all is gone!

London, 1699. 8vo. pp. 140, not including Preface.

By the Christ Church wits. The *Short Account* was just ready for publication when Bentley's second *Dissertation* came forth: the *Appendix* (which

Dr. Monk conjectures to have been written by King) was added after the appearance of that work.

15. *An Answer to a late Book written against the Learned and Reverend Dr. Bentley, relating to some Manuscript Notes on Callimachus. Together with an Examination of Mr. Bennet's Appendix to the said Book.* London, 1699. pp. 209, not including Preface.

An advertisement at the end of the Preface informs us that this piece was by the author of the translation of the Epistles of Phalaris. See article 13.

16. *A Letter to the Reverend Dr. Bentley upon the Controversie between him and Mr. Boyle.* London, 1699. 8vo.

This tract, noticed in Dr. Monk's *Life of Bentley*, vol. i. p. 131, I have not seen.

17. *A Chronological Account of the Life of Pythagoras, and of other Famous Men his Contemporaries. With an Epistle to the Rd Dr. Bentley, about Porphyry's and Jamblichus's Lives of Pythagoras. By the Right Reverend Father in God, William, Ld Bp of Coventry and Lichfield.* London, 1699. 8vo. pp. 58 of the Epistle (which is placed first), and pp. 18 of the Chron. Acc.

By Dr. Lloyd, to whom, as "an incomparable historian and chronologer," Bentley had appealed: see vol. i. p. 154 of the present work.

18. *Dialogues of the Dead. Relating to the present Controversy concerning the Epistles of Phalaris. By the Author of the Journey to London.* London, 1699. 8vo. pp. 83, not including Preface, &c.

By Dr. King, who smarted under the severe castigation he had received from Bentley: see vol. i. pp. xvii. xxi. of the present work.

19. *A short Review of the Controversy between Mr. Boyle and Dr. Bentley. With Suitable Reflections upon it. And the Dr.'s Advantagious Character of himself at full length. Recommended to the serious perusal of such as propose to be*

considered for their Fairness, Modesty, and good temper in Writing. London, 1701. 8vo. pp. 144, not including Preface.

Dr. Monk has no hesitation in believing that this piece was from Atterbury's pen, *Life of Bentley*, vol. i. p. 178; and Mr. Crossley of Manchester obligingly informs me, that on the title-page of a copy now in his possession is written, in a contemporary hand, "By Dr. Atterbury."

20. *Miscellanea. The Third Part. Containing*—I. *An Essay on Popular Discontents.* II. *An Essay upon Health and Long Life.* III. *A Defence of the Essay upon Ancient and Modern Learning. With some other Pieces. By the late Sir William Temple, Bar. Published by Jonathan Swift, A. M. Prebendary of St. Patrick's, Dublin.* London, 1701. 8vo. pp. 368, not including Preface.

The third of these essays, which, on the title-page immediately preceding it, is called *Some Thoughts upon reviewing the Essay of Ancient and Modern Learning*, was left unfinished by the author.

21. *Exercitationes Duæ: Prima, De Ætate Phalaridis; Secunda, De Ætate Pythagoræ Philosophi. Ab Henrico Dodwello, A. M. Dubliniensi.* Londini, 1704. 8vo. pp. 264, not including Præfatio, &c.

22. *A Tale of a Tub. Written for the Universal Improvement of Mankind. Diu multumque desideratum. To which is added, An Account of a Battel between the Ancient and Modern Books in St. James's Library.*

Basima eacabasa eanaa irraurista, diarba da cæotaba fobor camelanthi. Iren. lib. i. c. 18.

——— *Juvatque novos decerpere flores,*
Insignemque meo capiti petere inde coronam,
Unde prius nulli velarunt tempora Musæ. *Lucret.*

London, 1704. 8vo. pp. 322, not including Dedication, &c. *A Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the*

Spirit (not mentioned in the title-page of the volume), follows the *Battle of the Books.*

By Swift. Though not published till 1704, the *Tale of a Tub* and the *Battle of the Books* appear to have been ready for the press in 1697. In these pieces Swift directs the full bitterness of his inimitable humour against the adversaries of his patron, Sir W. Temple. For the ridicule on Bentley, see, in the *Tale of a Tub,* "The Dedication to Prince Posterity," and sections iii. v. and x.; and in the *Battle of the Books,* particularly "The Episode of Bentley and Wotton."

23. *A Defense of the Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning, in Answer to the Objections of Sir W. Temple, and Others. With Observations upon The Tale of a Tub. By William Wotton, B.D.* London, 1705. 8vo. pp. 69.

This tract, which was sold separately to the purchasers of the earlier editions of Wotton's *Reflections,* &c., was also printed (with new paging) as the concluding portion of the third edition of that work, 1705.

24. *Memoirs of the Life and Character of the late Earl of Orrery, and of the Family of the Boyles. Containing several Curious Facts and Pieces of History, from the Reign of Queen Elizabeth to the present Times: Extracted from Original Papers and Manuscripts never yet Printed. With a Short Account of the Controversy between the late Earl of Orrery and the Reverend Doctor Bentley; and some Select Letters of Phalaris, the famous Sicilian Tyrant, Translated from the Greek. By Eustace Budgell, Esq.*

—— Te, animo repetentem Exempla tuorum,
Et Pater Æneas, et Avunculus excitet Hector. *Virg.*

London, 1732. 8vo. pp. 258, not including Dedication, &c.

The *Epistola ad Millium,* the earliest work of Bentley, originally appeared at the end of the *Historia Chronica* of Malelas, which was published at Oxford in 1691, from the Baroccian MS., with the notes and Latin version of Chilmead, and the Prolegomena of Hody. While this Chronicle was in the press, Bentley's desire of seeing the sheets was gra-

tified by the editor, Dr. Mill, on condition that he should furnish remarks to be printed as an appendix to the work. Though the dulness and absurdity which he found in Malelas made him repent of the engagement, he eventually drew up his observations in the form of an epistle to the editor. In this brilliant and elaborate production, where he digresses into numerous interesting inquiries, his perfect familiarity with the whole body of ancient literature, his exquisite acuteness, and his wonderful felicity of conjectural emendation, were first displayed to the world.

1. *Joannis Antiocheni cognomento Malalæ Historia Chronica. E MS° Cod. Bibliothecæ Bodleianæ nunc primum edita. Cum Interpret. et Notis Edm. Chilmeadi, et triplici Indice Rerum, Autorum, et Vocum Barbararum. Præmittitur Dissertatio de Autore, per Humfredum Hodium, S. T. B. Coll. Wadhami Socium. Accedit Epistola Richardi Bentleii ad Cl. V. Jo. Millium, S. T. P. Cum Indice Scriptorum, qui ibi emendantur. Oxonii, e Theatro Sheldoniano,* 1691. 8vo.

Some copies have the date 1692.

2. *Emendationes in Menandri et Philemonis Reliquias, ex nupera Editione Joannis Clerici: ubi multa Grotii et aliorum, plurima vero Clerici errata castigantur, Auctore Phileleuthero Lipsiensi. Scriptæ Anno* MDCCX. *Accedit Epistola Critica Richardi Bentleii de Johanne Malela Antiocheno; Scripta Anno* MDCXCI. *Editio altera emendatior. Cantabrigiæ: typ. Academ.* 1713. 8vo.

The *Epistola ad Millium* is also reprinted at the end of *Malelæ Chron. Venetiis*, fol. 1733, and *Bonnæ*, 8vo. 1831, and in the volume entitled *Richardi Bentleii Opuscula Philologica, Lipsiæ*, 1781, 8vo.

ALEXANDER DYCE.

ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA.

Vol. i. Preface, p. xxii. note.—Instead of "in the prefatory matter to this volume," read "by Bentley, vol. ii. p. 133."

Vol. i. p. 78. note.—When I quoted the address to Wotton from Bentley's first *Dissertation on Phalaris*, I did not intend to include that essay in the present reprint: see vol. ii. p. 135.

Vol. i. p. 81. note s.—I ought to have observed, that in this quotation separate passages from the conclusion of the great scholar's *Proleg. in Manilium* (pp. 20, 21, ed. 1599) are strung together; and that Scaliger wrote "*nihil* copiosius" and "audiamus *igitur*."

Vol. i. p. 90. note.—Instead of "in the prefatory matter to this volume," read "in vol. ii. p. 133."

Vol. i. p. 110. note q.—On this epigram see also Blomfield, Præf. ad Æsch. *Pers.* p. xxv. ed. tert.

Vol. i. p. 266. l. 7.—For Ὦν read Ὧν.

Vol. i. p. 272. note.—Bentley calls the guard of Phalaris *blue-coats*, not only in allusion to the circumstance mentioned by Salter, but also because blue was once the colour usually worn by servants in England: see Gifford's ed. of B. Jonson's *Works*, vol. i. p. 52, and my ed. of Webster's *Works*, vol. iii. p. 156.

Vol. i. p. 355. l. 1.—Valckenaer has the following remarks on the language of the Pseudo-Phalaris: "De his Epistolis, a docto sophista, homine, meo quidem judicio, in Italia nato, cui Lingua Græca non erat vernacula, scriptis, pœne nimis est severum magni Bentleii, sed ab Editore Boyleo irritati, judicium . . . . . P. 200, 7. [ed. Lennep.] Ἐκτεῖναι δυνάμενος. . . . τὴν φήμην] Phrasis est Latina, non Græca. Virgiliana nota sunt:

breve et irreparabile tempus
Omnibus est vitæ: sed *famam extendere* factis,
Hoc virtutis opus.

Sunt in his Epistolis permulta, quæ mihi persuaserunt, earum scriptorem Linguam Græcam non a matre, sed e libris veterum didicisse." Præf. et Adnot. in *Phalar. Epist.* p. viii. et p. xviii.

Vol. i. p. 393. l. 3.—"Bentleius, p. 353 [ed. 1699], τῶν ἁλισγουμένων *impurorum* emendat. Nescio an alia sit auctoritas idonea vocis ἁλισγεῖν *contaminare* quam τῶν LXX. Certe lenior medela loci ad manum est; τῶν ἀναλισκομένων. Verba enim sunt, ὡς οὐ τιμῶται θεὸς ὑπ' ἀνθρώπου φαύλου, οὐδὲ θεραπεύεται δαπάναις οὐδὲ τραγῳδίαις τῶν ἀναλισκομένων, *impensarum*, καθ. μοχ. ἄνθ." Heynii *Opusc. Acad.* (not.) t. ii. p. 20.

Vol. i. p. 417. l. 3.—" Super voce *ἐμφυσιοῦν*, quæ et infra occurrit *ἵν' ἐμφυσιῶται ἑκάστῳ τὰ παραγγέλματα*, gravis est censura Bentleii p. 376 [ed. 1699], qui adeo barbarum auctorem prodi hoc ipso contendebat, quod vocabulum, vulgari usu pro *ἐμφυσᾷν*, *inflare*, adhiberi solitum, usurpaverit tanquam a *φύσις* ductum, ut sit *in naturam et indolem convertere*. Iniquissima vero strictura. Est enim voc. Pythagoreis, seu veris, seu imitatoribus, hoc sensu frequentatum: sic Hippodamus de Rep. apud Stob. xli. *τὰ δὲ ἔθη καὶ ἐπιτηδεύματα πλάσσει καὶ κηροχυτεῖ τὰν ψυχὰν, φυσίωσιν ἐμποιεῦντα διὰ τῆς συνεχέος συνεργίης*: h. *habitu in naturam verso*. Apud Porphyr. de Abstin. i. 29. *ἡ κατὰ τὰ ὄντως ὄντα φυσίωσις καὶ ζωή*, iii. 11. *φυσιοῦσθαι a natura vim habere*." Heynii *Opusc. Acad.* (not.) t. ii. p. 82.

In the same vol., pp. 17, 19, 41, 62, 70, 104, 153, 154, 162, 164, Heyne objects to various other parts of Bentley's dissertation on the Laws of Zaleucus and Charondas.

Vol. ii. p. 47. l. 23.—For " Damareta" read " Demareta."

A

DISSERTATION

UPON THE

EPISTLES OF PHALARIS.

WITH AN

ANSWER TO THE OBJECTIONS OF

THE HONOURABLE CHARLES BOYLE, ESQUIRE.

(*From ed.* 1699.)

Mordear OPPROBRIIS FALSIS, *mutemque colores?*
FALSUS HONOR *juvat, et* MENDAX INFAMIA *terret*
Quem, nisi MENDACEM *et* MENDOSUM?

HORAT. *Epist.* i. 16.

THE PREFACE.

In the former edition of this *Dissertation*, A.D. MDCXCVII., I thought myself obliged to take notice of a certain passage in a Preface to *Phalaris's Epistles*, published at Oxford two years before. Which I did in these words:

"The late Editors of *Phalaris* have told the world, in "their Preface, that, among other specimens of their dili-"gence, they collated the King's Manuscript, as far as the "XL. Epistle; and would have done so throughout, but "that the Library-keeper, *out of his singular humanity*, "denied them the further use [of] it.[a] This was meant as a "lash for me, who had the honour then and since to serve "his Majesty in that office. I must own, 'twas very well "resolved of them, to make the Preface and the Book all of "a piece: for they have acted in this calumny both the "injustice of the Tyrant, and the forgery of the Sophist. "For my own part, I should never have honoured it with "a refutation in print, but have given it that neglect, that "is due to weak detraction; had I not been engaged to my "friend to write a censure upon *Phalaris;* where to omit to "take notice of that slander, would be tacitly to own it. "The true story is thus: A Bookseller came to me, in the "name of the Editors, to beg the use of the Manuscript. It "was not then in my custody: but, as soon as I had the "power of it, I went voluntarily and offered it him, bidding "him tell the Collator not to lose any time; for I was "shortly to go out of town for two months. 'Twas deli-

[a] Collatas etiam curavi usque ad Ep. 40. cum MS^to in Bibliothecâ Regiâ, cujus mihi copiam ulteriorem Bibliothecarius pro singulari suâ humanitate negavit.

" vered, used, and returned. Not a word said by the " bearer, nor the least suspicion in me, that they had not " finished the collation. For, I speak from experiment, they " had more days to compare it in, than they needed to have " hours. 'Tis a very little book, and the writing as legible " as print. Well; the collation, it seems, was sent defec- " tive to Oxon; and the blame, I suppose, laid upon me. " I returned again to the Library some months before the " Edition was finished: no application was made for further " use of the Manuscript. Thence I went for a whole fort- " night to Oxon, where the Book was then printing; con- " versed in the very college where the Editors resided. Not " the least whisper there of the Manuscript. After a few " days, out comes the new Edition, with this sting in the " mouth of it. 'Twas a surprise, indeed, to read there, that " our Manuscript was not perused. Could not they have " asked for it again then, after my return? 'Twas neither " *singular* nor *common humanity*, not to inquire into the " truth of the thing, before they ventured to print; which " is a sword in the hand of a child. But there's a reason " for every thing; and the mystery was soon revealed. " For, it seems, I had the hard hap, in some private con- " versation, to say, the *Epistles* were a spurious piece, and " unworthy of a new edition. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ*. This " was a thing deeply resented; and to have spoken to me " about the Manuscript, had been to lose a plausible occa- " sion of taking revenge."

This I then thought was sufficient to vindicate myself from that little aspersion. But I am now constrained, by the worse usage that I have since met with from the same quarter, to give an account of some particulars; which then I omitted, partly out of an unwillingness to trouble the public with complaints about private and personal injuries, but chiefly out of a tenderness for the honour of the Editor.

The first time I saw his new *Phalaris*, was in the hands of a person of Honour, to whom it had been presented; and

the rest of the impression was not yet published. This encouraged me to write the very same evening to Mr. Boyle at Oxford, and to give him a true information of the whole matter; expecting that, upon the receipt of my letter, he would put a stop to the publication of his Book, till he had altered that passage, and printed the page anew; which he might have done in one day, and at the charge of five shillings. I did not expressly desire him to take out that passage, and reprint the whole leaf; that I thought was too low a submission. But I said enough to make any person of common justice and ingenuity have owned me thanks for preventing him from doing a very ill action.

I am sorry I have not the letter itself to produce on this occasion: but I neither took any copy of it; nor was I careful to keep the gentleman's letter, which I received in answer. I had no apprehension at that time that the business could have been blown to this height. But the gentleman, it seems, had something at that time in his view, and was more careful to keep my letter, a part of which he has thus published: *Mr. Bennet desired me to lend him the Manuscript* Phalaris, *to be collated; because a young gentleman, Mr. Boyle of Christ-Church, was going to publish it. I told him, That a gentleman of that name and family, to which I had so many obligations, and should always have an honour for, might command any service that lay in my power* (p. 19). These he acknowledges to be *civil expressions* (ibid. and p. 4.): and I dare trust my memory so far, as to aver that all the rest were of the same strain. Nay, as the Examiner has given us this fragment of my letter, because he thought he saw a fault in't, which I shall answer anon: so if there had been any thing else in that letter, either in the words or the matter, that he could but have cavilled at; without doubt he would have favoured us with more of it: for we may easily see his good-will to me, both from his *Preface* and his *Examination*.

But what return did he make me for my *expressions of great civility?* (p. 4.) After a delay of two posts; on

purpose, as one may justly suspect, that the Book might be vended (as it was) and spread abroad in the mean time; I received an answer to this effect: *That what I had said in my own behalf might be true; but that Mr. Bennet had represented the thing quite otherwise. If he had had my account before, he should have considered of it: and now that the Book was made public, he would not interpose, but that I might do myself right in what method I pleased.* This was the import of his answer, as I very well remember: there was not the least hint that he had or would stop the publication of his Book till the matter was farther examined.

The gentleman himself, in his late Treatise, has been pleased to give some account of the same letter; and he represents his expression thus: That, if the matter appeared as I had told it, *he meant to give me satisfaction as publicly as he had injured me* (p. 4). But I am sorry that his civility comes three years too late. Less than this would have passed with me for good satisfaction. But it was not, *that he would give me satisfaction,* but *that I had his free leave to take it:* which was in answer to a paragraph of my letter, *that perhaps I might think myself obliged to make a public vindication.* And this, as I take it, was so far from being a just *satisfaction,* that it was plainly a defiance, and an addition to the affront.

The gentleman and I here differ a little about the expression in his answer; but I suppose the very circumstances will plainly discover whose account is the truer. For what probability is there, that he should promise such fair satisfaction; and yet let the Book be published when it was in his power to stop it? If he had writ me word the very next post, that he had stopped the Books in the printing-house, and would suffer no more to go abroad till the matter was fairly examined: this had been just and civil. And then, if he had found himself misinformed by his Bookseller, he might have cut out the leaf, and printed a new one; which in all respects had been the fairest, and cheapest, and quickest satisfaction.

Several persons have been so far misinformed by false reports of this story, that they think the Editor himself desired the MS. either by letter to me, or by a personal visit. I heartily wish it had been so; for then all this dispute had been prevented. But the gentleman was not pleased to honour me with his commands. If he had favoured me with one line, or had sent his desire by any scholar, I would not only have lent the Book, but have collated it myself for him. But it was both our misfortunes, that he committed the whole affair to the care, or rather negligence, of his Bookseller: and the first application himself made to me was by that compliment in his printed Preface.

I am surprised to see an *Honourable* person think he has fully justified himself for abusing me, by reasons that he has found out since the time of the abuse. For even take his own account; and when he printed that Preface, he had heard nothing but on one side. And was that like a man of his character, to put a public affront upon me, upon the bare complaint of a Bookseller, who was the party suspected of the fault? What? never to inquire at all, whether he had not misinformed him; when there was such reason to suppose, that he might lay the blame upon me, to excuse his own negligence; when he had such opportunities of asking me, either directly, or by some common friends? Turn it over on every side, and the whole conduct of it is so very extraordinary, that one cannot but suspect there were some secret reasons for this usage, that are not yet brought above-board. Be it as it will; 'tis in vain to hope to justify that calumny in his Preface by such testimonies, as he knew nothing of when he ventured to print it. He is fallen under his own reproof, *That he wrote his Preface first, and finds reasons for it afterwards* (p. 2).

When his *Phalaris* came first abroad, 'twas the opinion of my friends, who were soon satisfied that the thing was a calumny, that it was the duty of my place, as Keeper of the Royal Library, to defend the honour of it against such

an insult. But yet, out of a natural aversion to all quarrels and broils, and out of regard to the Editor himself, I resolved to take no notice of it, but to let the matter drop.

Thus it rested for two years; and should have done so for ever; had not some accidents fallen out, which made it necessary for me to give a public account of it. I had formerly made a promise to my worthy friend Mr. Wotton, to give him a paper of some reasons, why I thought *Phalaris's Epistles* supposititious, and the present *Æsopean Fables* not to be Æsop's own. And upon such an occasion, I was plainly obliged to speak of that calumny: for my silence would have been interpreted as good as a confession: especially considering with what industrious malice the false story had been spread all over England; for, as it's generally practised, they thought one act of injustice was to be supported and justified by doing many more.

The gentleman is pleased to insinuate, that all this is *pure fiction;* and that I writ that Dissertation out of revenge, and purely for an occasion of telling the story (p. 4, 24, &c.): the very contrary of which is true; for I was unwilling to meddle in that Dissertation, because I should be necessitated to give an account of that story: as it will plainly appear from Mr. Wotton's own testimony, which I have by me under his hand:

I do declare, that, in the year 1694, *when my* Discourse about Ancient and Modern Learning *was first put to the press, Dr. Bentley at my desire undertook to write a Dissertation about Phalaris and Æsop, to be added to my book. But, being called away into the country, he could not at that time be as good as his word. Afterwards, when the second edition of my book was in the press, I renewed my request to him, and challenged his promise. He desired me to excuse him; because now the case was altered, and he could not write that Dissertation without giving a censure of the late Edition at Oxford. But I did not think that a sufficient reason, why I should lose that treatise to the world, by*

receding from the right and power that he had given me to demand it. W. WOTTON.

The reader will please to observe, that Mr. Wotton's *Discourse* was first printed 1694; and *Phalaris* the year after. A plain argument, that the Examiner is quite out in his reckoning, when he pretends that I first engaged in that Dissertation, purely to fall foul on his Book. I was so far from harbouring such *vengeance in my heart*, that if the Editor, or any body from him, had but given me leave to say in his name, *That he had been misinformed;* all this story, and all the errors of his Edition, had slept quiet in their obscurity.

About nine months after my Dissertation was printed, the Editor of *Phalaris* obliged the world with a second piece, called *Dr. Bentley's Dissertations examined.* He has begun that elaborate work with stating an account of this story in opposition to what I had said of it: and that he does upon the credit and testimonies of the *Bookseller* and the *Collator*, and of a third *Informant*, who overheard some discourse of mine. I will give a clear and full answer to every part of their depositions; and I question not but to make it plain, that the Examiner has been imposed on, not only by the author of *Phalaris's Letters*, but by others that are every way of lower qualifications than he.

The Bookseller avers, *That he was employed by the Honourable Mr. Boyle, and by him only, to borrow the MS. of Phalaris from Dr. Bentley. And, after about* NINE *months' solicitation*, says he, *it was delivered into my custody, without any time limited for the return of it* (p. 6). I now perceive, I had more reason than I was then aware of, when I said in my Dissertation, that a falsehood about time was the truest and surest method of detecting impostures. And Mr. B., I hope, will allow that a chronological argument will be a good proof against his Bookseller, though he will not admit it against his Book. The Bookseller, we see, is positive, that I did not lend him the MS. *till after about* NINE *months'*

solicitation. And Mr. B. himself repeats it, *That there was about* NINE *months' solicitation used to procure it* (p. 19): and in another place he affirms, *That the Bookseller gave him liberty to assure the world, that he was ready to justify it with his* OATH, *when it should be duly required of him* (p. 5). Now if, instead of these NINE *months*, I make it appear beyond contradiction, that, from my very first admission to the office of Library-keeper, to the time that the Bookseller not only had, but returned the MS., there was but ONE single month; I humbly conceive, the world will be satisfied, that not the word only, but the very OATH of this witness, is little to be regarded.

The Royal Patent, which constitutes me *Keeper of His* MAJESTY'S *Libraries* (which may be seen not only in my own hands, but in the Patent-Office) bears date the xiith day of April, MDCXCIV. The words are, *In cujus rei testimonium has Literas nostras fieri fecimus Patentes, Testibus nobis ipsis apud Westmonasterium, duodecimo die Aprilis, anno regni nostri sexto.* Now I may appeal to any body, that has ever been concerned in a patent; if, by reason of the delays that necessarily attend a thing of that nature, it may not fairly be supposed that the remaining part of that month expired, before all could be finished. I find in a book of my private accounts, that I took the patent out of the Patent-Office the xviiith day of that month: and the several Offices to be attended after that, before I could have admission to the Library, may be allowed to take up the rest of the month. But I shall prove the thing directly by two witnesses beyond all exception, the worthy Masters of St. Paul's and St. James's Schools, who gave me this account under their own hands:

Some time after the death of Mr. Justell, late Library-keeper to his Majesty, we were desired by his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, then Lord Bishop of Lincoln, in*

[* Dr. Thomas Tenison, translated from Lincoln to Canterbury in 1694.—*Note on ed.* 1777.]

pursuance of a command from the late Queen of blessed memory, to take a Catalogue of the Royal Library at St. James's. We began it in October 1693, *finished, and had it transcribed, and presented to her Majesty by the Easter following; during all which time we had the key of the said Library constantly in our keeping, as also some weeks longer. And then, as we were directed, we delivered it up to Sir John Lowther, now the Right Honourable the Lord Lonsdale, who was at that time Vice-chamberlain to His Majesty.*

JO. POSTLETHWAYT.
RICH. WRIGHT.

It is plain then from the date of a public record, joined with Mr. Postlethwayt's and Mr. Wright's testimonies, that I had not actual custody of the Royal Library before May. For, in that year, Easter fell upon April the viiith. And it's deposed here, that the key of the Library was not delivered to the Vice-chamberlain, from whose hands I was to receive it, till *some weeks after* Easter. And in the same May I delivered the MS. to the Bookseller; for, as I had said before, *as soon as I had it in my power, I went voluntarily to the Bookseller, and offered it him.* The Bookseller has not yet thought fit to deny that the Book was delivered to him in May; and, to save him from the temptation of denying it hereafter, I will prove, by another record, that the Book was used and restored to me again, and lodged in his Majesty's Library, before the end of that month. For the reason why I insisted to have the MS. speedily returned was, because I was obliged to make a journey to Worcester, to keep my residence there as Prebendary of that church. And that I was at Worcester by the first of June following; the following certificate will prove, the original of which I have by me:

It appears, by the Chantor's Rolls, kept to note the presence of the Dean and Prebendaries of the Cathedral Church of Worcester, that Dr. Richard Bentley, Prebendary of the

said Cathedral Church, was present at prayers in the Quire there on the first day of June in the year 1694, *and continued his attendance there till September the* 26*th following, not absenting more than two days at any one time all the while. Witness my hand, this* 25*th day of May,* 1698.

ANDREW TREBECK, *Chantor.*

We have seen and examined the Chantor's Rolls above mentioned, and do find them as he hath above certified; and we did see him sign this certificate.

JO. PRICE, *Chancellor.*
CH. MOORE, *Pub. Not. Reg.*
THO. OLIVER, *Pub. Notary.*

I must crave leave to observe to the reader, that the Residence Roll for the month of May, though diligently sought for, could not be found. But, if it ever happen to come to sight, I make no doubt but it will appear by it, that I was present at Worcester some part of that May. For it's great odds, that the first day of my being there would not fall upon the first of June. The last note of time, before I took mv journey, that I can now find among all my papers, is the xvth day of May. And I find a letter to me out of Surrey, dated May the xth, that then wishes me a good journey. All which makes me believe, that I left London upon Monday May the xxist, and that the MS. was returned to me the Saturday night before.

But not to insist upon that; I suppose it's sufficiently manifest, from his Majesty's Patent, Mr. Postlethwayt's and Mr. Wright's testimonies, and the Residence Rolls of the Church of Worcester, that the MS. was delivered, used, and returned, within the space of ONE month after I had the custody of the Library. So that the deposition of the Bookseller, *That he could not obtain the MS. till after about* NINE *months' solicitation*, is demonstrated to be a notorious falsehood: and since he has farther declared that it was in his

intention a perjury, he has pilloried himself for't in print, as long as that book shall last.

I have been informed by several good hands, that when the starters of this calumny heard how I could disprove, from the very date of the Patent, this story of NINE *months' solicitation;* they betook themselves to this refuge, That though the Patent was not finished till about May, yet I had the power and trust of the Library for NINE months before. But, besides the folly of this evasion, which is visible at first view (for how could I demand the key of the Library, before I had a right to it?), Mr. Postlethwayt and Mr. Wright give a direct evidence, that *they had the key constantly in their keeping all the time from October to May;* so that I had not the MS. in my power till the very time that I lent it. Nay, the very warrant, where his Majesty first nominated me to that employment, was but taken out of the Secretary's office Decemb. xxiii., 1693. There were but FIVE months therefore in all, from the first rumour of my being Library-keeper to the time that they had the MS. And the Bookseller, even by this account, was plainly guilty of an intended perjury, when he was ready to swear, *that he used about* NINE *months' solicitation.* But suppose it were true, that NINE months had elapsed from the date of the warrant to my admission to the Library: yet what an honest and ingenuous narrative is here of *nine months'* SOLICITATION! That word carries this accusation in't, that I could have lent them the Book if I pleased: which appears now to be a mere calumny and slander, since it lays that to my charge, which was not in my power.

By his talking of SOLICITATION, one would be apt to imagine that he had worn the very streets with frequent journeys to solicit for the MS. I had said in my former account, *that a Bookseller* CAME *to me in the name of the Editors:* which is a word of more concession than the pains he was at deserved. For, to the best of my memory, he never asked me for the MS. but at his own shop, or as I casually met him. Neither can I call to mind that either he

or his apprentice came once to my lodgings or to the Library for't; till the time that he sent for't by my appointment, and received it.

I had said, *That I ordered him to tell the Collator, not to lose any time; for I was shortly to go out of town for two months.* Now this was to be denied by the Bookseller, or else his whole deposition had signified nothing; for the blame would still lie at his own door. He resolutely affirms therefore, *That no time was limited for the return of it* (p. 6). What can be done in this case? Here are two contrary affirmations; and the matter being done in private, neither of us have any witness. I might plead, as Æmilius Scaurus did against one Varius of Sucro: *Varius Sucronensis ait, Æmilius Scaurus negat: utri creditis, Quirites?*[b] I hope, upon any account, my credit will go further than this Bookseller's, especially after his manifest falsehood in his story of the *nine months.*

But let us inquire into the nature of the thing. Is it likely, or probable, that I should put the MS. into his hands, to be kept as long as he pleased; without any intimating that, after a competent time for using it, he should restore it again? They must certainly have an odd opinion of their readers, that expect to make such stuff as this pass upon them for truth. Besides, it appears upon record, that I took a journey soon after the lending of it: which was not a sudden and unexpected one; for the time of my residence had been fixed six months before. I must needs know then of my intended journey, when I lent the MS. to the Bookseller: and 'tis very unlikely that I should omit to give him notice of it; unless it be supposed that I had then a private design to disappoint them of the use of the MS.

But that I had no such design, but, on the contrary, a true intention and desire to give them full opportunity of using it, I conceive the very circumstances of the affair,

[b] Val. Max. iii. 7.

besides my own declaration which I here solemnly make, will put it out of all question. For, I pray, what interest, what passion, could I serve by hindering them? I could have no pique against the Editor, whom I had never seen nor heard of before; and who, as soon as I heard of him, both deserved and had my respect, upon account of his relation to a person of glorious memory. Neither could I envy him the honour of publishing the MS., or repine that such an opportunity of getting fame was taken out of my own hands: for I suppose my *Dissertation* alone is a convincing argument, that I myself had never any design of setting out *Phalaris*.

But I have a better proof still behind of my sincerity in lending the MS.; though I cannot produce it without accusing myself. For it's the duty of my place, to let no book go out of the King's Library without particular order. This the learned Dr. Mill and several others know; who, having occasion for some books in the time of my predecessor, were obliged to procure his Majesty's warrant for them. If it were my design then to keep the Book out of the Editor's hands, what fairer pretence, what readier excuse, could be wished, than this? "That I was ready to serve "the gentleman to the utmost of my power; but it was "a rule with my predecessors, to let no book go abroad "without a Royal warrant. And I durst not venture to "transgress the rule at my very first entrance upon my "office. If the gentleman would obtain an order in the "usual method, I would wait upon him the first moment, "and deliver the Book." I could have refused the MS. in this manner with all the appearance of civility: but, out of a particular desire of obliging the Editor, I ventured beyond my power, and lent the Book privately without any order. I confess, I have justly suffered for it since; and the very men I aimed to oblige were my enemies (as they give it out) only on that account. Had I kept myself firm to the rules of my office, without straining a point of courtesy beyond the bounds of my duty; all their calumnies had been

avoided. But, I hope, I shall have caution enough for the future, to know persons a little better, before I put myself in their power.

I had said, that *I had no suspicion, that the Collation was not finished.* In opposition to this, the Bookseller deposes, *that I called upon him for the Book upon Saturday at noon; and staid while he sent to the Collator, and word was brought by the messenger, that it was not collated.* That I called then at the Bookseller's shop, I believe may be true: for, having business to despatch in Paul's Churchyard, and some friends there to take leave of, before I began my journey, I took that occasion to call upon this Bookseller, and to mind him of his engagement to restore the Book on Saturday evening. But that I staid there till his messenger returned from the Collator, I do not remember. But suppose that I did stay; what then? The message, he says, was brought *at noon*, that the Book was not then collated. But the Bookseller well knows, that I did not require the Book till the evening; nor was it returned before. The Collator indeed might be behindhand at noon, and, as I might suppose, want about two or three pages. But must I needs think him still behindhand at nine a'clock at night? That's a sort of consequence that I am not used to make. For, if he had not done one page of the Book at noon; yet he had time more than enough to have finished it by the evening. For, as I said before, *it is as legible as print*, being written in a modern hand, and without abbreviations; and wants one and twenty epistles that are extant in the printed copies, which is a seventh part of the whole Book; so that the work of collating is so much the shorter. I had a mind, for the experiment's sake, to collate the first forty epistles, which are all that the Collator has done. And I had finished them in an hour and eighteen minutes; though I made no very great haste. And yet I remarked and set down above Fifty various lections, though the Editor has taken notice of One only. Now if 40 epistles can be collated in an hour and 18 min., the whole MS., which contains but 127

epistles, may be collated in four hours. The Collator then, had he been diligent, might have finished the whole collation twice over, between noon and the close of the evening, when the Book was returned.

As for the Collator, I am utterly a stranger both to his person and character: and have nothing to say to him, but that his testimony is as useless and imperfect as his collations. Indeed it's hard to conjecture, to what purpose it is produced (p. 7). The sum of it is, *That the MS. was sent for before he had finished;* which is confessed on all hands. It had been more to the purpose, if he had told us what he was doing all that time that the MS. was in his hands. I say, *five or six days;* the Bookseller says, *a few;* Mr. Boyle, *not nine* (p. 20). By the shortest account, it now appears, as I said before, *that he had more days to compare it in, than he needed to have hours.* And how did he spend the last afternoon, which was more than sufficient to do the whole work in? Whether he undertook it for a reward, or out of kindness, the Editor was not very much obliged to him.

The Bookseller adds further, *That I utterly refused to leave the MS. with him beyond Saturday, though he begged but to have it till Sunday morning, and engaged to oblige the Collator to sit up at it all Saturday night.* How false and silly this is, the sagacious readers must needs see and acknowledge. This was spoken on *Saturday at noon,* by the Bookseller's own confession. And he had then free leave to keep it, and did keep it, till the evening. And the whole collation was but the work of four hours, as I have proved by experiment. And yet he has the face to tell the world, that he would engage the Collator to sit up all night to finish it: when the whole might be done, from the beginning to the end, twice over before candle-light. Why I would not have spared it till *Sunday* morning, suppose I had been asked, there might be several good reasons. I was to take coach for Worcester by five a'clock on *Monday* morning: and I could have no leisure on *Sunday* to put

the Book into the Library; for at that time I lived with the Right Reverend the Bishop of Worcester,* at a good distance from the Library. The key too of the outward door was then in custody of another; who perhaps might not be met with upon *Sunday*. Besides that there was time enough and to spare before *Saturday* evening: and what obligation had I to neglect my own business to humour others in their laziness?

But, he says, *I gave him not the least hopes, that, if he applied to me upon my return out of the country, he should have leave to get the collation perfected.* That I gave him not any hopes of it by an express promise, I verily believe. For how could I do that, when I was fully persuaded they would finish the collation before I went into the country? But what he saw in me, that forbad him to hope it if there should be occasion, I cannot imagine. He knew, the reason why I then demanded the Book, was my journey into the country. I was to make so long a stay there, that it was not fit to expose the Book all that while to the hazard of being lost. I told the Bookseller then, *that I was to be absent for two months:* but it appears now upon record, that I was four months at Worcester. And how many accidents might have happened in that time! Should I, who was under a trust, and accountable to God and man, run such a risk without any warrant? The Editor and his Witnesses may calumniate as they please: but I wish I could as well justify my lending the MS. out, as my calling it in.

The Bookseller concludes, *That I made some reflections from time to time, when he spoke to me from Mr. B.; but, considering his employment, it may not be proper to add an account of them* (p. 7). So that he puts off that piece of work to one *Dr. King of the Commons*, as the Examiner styles him. Now what he means by *reflections*, or what harm there is in *making reflections*, I do not under-

[* Dr. Edward Stillingfleet.—*Note on ed.* 1777.]

stand. A great person, *one of the Examiner's family* (p. 3), made a whole Book of *Reflections;* and I never yet heard it was counted a crime in him. I am as much to seek too for his meaning, *That his employment makes it not proper for him to add an account of those reflections.* His employment, as a Bookseller, I think a very reputable one, if he himself be not a disgrace to't. And if that make it *not proper* for him to bear false witness against his neighbour by a pretended *account of those reflections:* methinks the profession of the Dr. to whom he refers himself is more *improper* for that work. The Dr. indeed by his profession may be enabled to do it with more cunning; but he would do it with the greater crime. But let us hear the Dr.'s testimony; the air and spirit of it is so very extraordinary; the virulency and *insolence* so far above the common pitch; that it puts one in mind of *Rupilius King,* a great ancestor of the Dr.'s, commended to posterity by Horace[c] under this honourable character,

Proscripti Regis Rupili pus atque venenum,

The filth and venom of Rupilius King.

And if the Dr. do not inherit the estate of *Rupilius;** yet the whole world must allow, that he is heir of his virtues; as his own writings will vouch for him, his deposition here against me, his buffoonery upon the learned Dr. Lister,† and some other monuments of his learning and his morals.

I have endeavoured, says the Dr., *as far as I can, to recollect what passed between Mr. Bennet and Dr. Bentley, concerning a MS. of the Epistles of Phalaris. I cannot be*

[c] Sat. I. vii. 1.

[* Dr. B.'s memory failed him here: it was not Rupilius, but his adversary Persius; who permagna negotia dives habebat Clazomenis: Or, perhaps, he mistook wittingly; in order to contrast the better the one's *pus atque venenum* with the other's estate.—SALTER. *Ad. note on ed.* 1777.]

[† King had published a humorous piece, entitled *A Journey to London, in the year* 1698, *after the ingenious method of that made by Dr. Martin Lister to Paris, in the same year, &c.*: see it in King's *Original Works,* I. 187.—D.]

certain as to ANY OTHER *particulars, than that, among other things, the Dr. said, That if the MS. were collated, it would be worth nothing for the future* (p. 8). Now the reader may please to take notice, that the Dr. here publicly owns, *That he cannot be certain as to any other particulars:* and yet *he endeavoured to recollect, as far as he could;* and *the scorn,* he says, *and contempt, which he has naturally for pride and insolence, made him remember that, which otherwise he might have forgot.* (ibid.) Now, if the Doctor, even whetted with his *scorn and contempt,* could but call to mind ONE particular, and if that particular have nothing at all in't about Mr. B., nor any thing that borders upon *pride and insolence;* what pretence has he for traducing me here, as a proud and insolent man, and an abuser of Mr. Boyle? If the Dr., as he owns, has but ONE particular from his *memory,* the rest he must have from his *invention.* I am obliged indeed to the Dr.; for he has effectually disproved himself in his own deposition. For he first declares, he knows but ONE particular; and yet presently runs into a charge, whereof nothing can be made out from that particular. And would such an evidence as this is, pass *in Doctors' Commons?* I am much mistaken, if the worthy persons that preside there would dismiss such a witness as this without marks of their dissatisfaction.

To account then for that *one particular,* that the Dr. *is certain of.* The reader must give me leave to tell him a short story. After I was nominated to the Library-keeper's office (before the Patent was finished), I was informed, that one copy of every book printed in England, which were due to the Royal Library by Act of Parliament,* had not of late

[* By the Stat. 13 and 14 Car. II. commonly called "The Licensing Act," chap. 32. sect. 17. it was enacted, That every Printer should reserve *three* printed Copies, of the best and largest paper, of every Book new printed, or reprinted by him with additions, and, before the public vending of the same, deliver them to the Master of the Stationers' Company; who was thereby directed to deliver One Copy to the Keeper of his Majesty's Library, and the other Two to the Vice-chancellors of the Two Universities for the use of their

been brought into the Library according to the said Act. Upon this, I made application to the Master of the Stationers' Company, to whom the Act directed me, and demanded the copies. The effect whereof was, that I procured near a thousand volumes, of one sort or other, which are now lodged in the Library. While this was transacting, I chanced to call upon Mr. Bennet (whom I had several times obliged), and acquainted him with it; not questioning but he would be very ready to comply, as far as his share went; which was then but very little. But, to my surprise, he answered me very pertly, That he knew not what right the Parliament had to give away any man's property; that he hoped the Company of Stationers would refuse, and try it out at law; that they were a Body, and had a common purse; and more to this purpose. Some little time after, calling there again, upon a fresh discourse about the MS. *Phalaris*, which I had formerly promised to lend him as soon as I had power; I asked him, Upon what account he could refuse to give the Royal Library its due, settled on it by Act of Parliament; and at the same time expect a favour out of it, that would make his own book more vendible, and the MS. less valuable? *For, after the Various Lections were once taken and printed, the MS. would be like a squeezed orange, and little worth for the future.* Since, therefore, he was resolved to try the law against the Library, he ought in justice to present to it some book of competent value, to make amends for the damage it would sustain by his using the MS.

This discourse I very well remember; and, I believe, I can bring witness that heard me relate it long before the

Libraries. This Act was made for Two years; and from thence continued to the year 1679, when it expired. It was afterwards revived by 1 Jac. II. c. 17., and continued to 1692; and then to 1694, when it finally expired; some months after Dr. Bentley's appointment to his office. It is printed in the Appendix to Ruffhead's Edition.—By the Stat. 8 Anne, still in force, it was enacted, that *nine* Copies of every Book should, in like manner, be delivered to Stationers' Hall, for the Royal Library, Sion College, the Six Universities in Great Britain, and the Advocates' Library at Edinburgh.—*Note on ed.* 1777.]

Dr.'s deposition came abroad; and I take it for certain, that this was the very same conversation which Dr. King overheard. 'Tis true, there is some small difference in the account: I said, that the MS. would be worth *little* for the future; and the Dr. says, *worth nothing*. But that is no material change; and may be excused in the Dr., who is not over-nice in his expressions. But do I remember, that the Dr. was present then? No, nor any time else; for I know him not, if I meet him; and perhaps my *pride and insolence* might lie in that, that I did not know a person *of such known credit in the world* (p. 5). Allowing then, that this was the *free conference* (as the Examiner calls it, p. 9,) which the Dr. overheard, I have a few things to observe in the narrative that he has made of it.

It appears, first, that his pert reflection, which he thought carried such a sting in it, is very silly and insipid. *Which I took the more notice of*, says he, *because I thought a MS. good for nothing, unless it were collated.* Wonderful remark, and worthy of such eves-droppers, that are prowling after that which does not concern them, and catch at little scraps of other men's discourses. 'Tis true, Sir, a MS. not collated is upon that account worth nothing to the rest of the world; but to the owner 'tis the better for it, if a price was to be set on't. And I think, with submission, that a fresh MS. newly brought out of Greece, and never yet printed, would sell for more, *cæteris paribus*, than another already printed. Do you think the Alexandrian MS. of as great a value now, since the edition of the English Polyglot, as when Cyril the Greek Patriarch first presented it to King Charles the First? But what do I talk to him of MSS. who has so little relish and sense of such things, as to declare deliberately, *That he does not believe the various readings of* ANY BOOK *are so much worth, as that Mr. Boyle should be used so scurvily to obtain them* (p. 8). And this he says, when he is giving *evidence*: where all declaimings and rhetorical aggravations above the naked and strict truth are unlawful, and border near upon perjury. But we must not expect from the

Dr., that he should know the *worth of books:* for he is better skilled in the catalogues of ales, his *Humty-dumty, Hugmatee, Three-threads,** and the rest of that glorious list, than in the catalogues of MSS.

But, pray, what was that *scurvy usage* that I gave to Mr. Boyle? The Dr. remembers but ONE *particular;* and that has no relation to Mr. Boyle. I am almost persuaded, that Mr. Boyle's name was not once mentioned in that conversation. For this talk was not had the last time, when I called for the MS.; but long before, when my patent was not yet passed, and before I had the custody of the Library. But suppose Mr. B. was named then, I am sure it must be with respect. For how could I use him *scurvily,* in denying him a MS. which was not then in my power to give? Before the time of that discourse, I had promised that the MS., when I could come at it, should be at Mr. Boyle's service; and in such words as Mr. Boyle himself owns to be *expressions of great civility* (p. 4, 19): *That a gentleman of that name and family, to which I had so many obligations, and should always have an honour for, might command any service that lay in my power.* That I really used these expressions, even the Bookseller himself is my witness: for, if it had not been true, he would never have let it be printed, without contradicting it. Now, how is it credible, that I should use a man so *civilly,* and yet so *scurvily* too? A man must be dosed with *Humty-dumty,* that could talk so inconsistently. And how could I abuse a young gentleman, whom I had never heard of before, without any provocation, in a public place, and before his own friends? I dare appeal to any, that ever was acquainted with me, if he think me capable of doing so.

All the discourse, then, that the Dr. overheard, had relation only to the Bookseller. Mr. Boyle was sure of the MS.

* See his *Journey to London.* [Vide note (†), p. xvii. The passage to which Bentley alludes is this: "He answered me, that he had a thousand such sort of liquors, as '*humtie-dumtie, three-threads,* four-threads, old Pharoah, knockdown, *hugmetee,*'" &c.—D.]

which I had promised before. But I had a mind to make the Bookseller sensible of his ill-manners, in denying justice to the King's Library, at the same time that he asked favours. And I do further declare, that I was but in jest, when I told him, That he should give a book to the Royal Library, to recompense for the use of the MS.; and I had no design in't, but to mortify him a little for his pertness about going to law. For when the time came that I could lend him the MS., he had it freely, without giving to the Library the value of a printed sermon. Though I remember, when I once told this story to a very great man, his answer was, That, if I was not in earnest, I ought to have been so.

The Bookseller says, *His employment makes it not proper for him to give an account of the reflections I made, as we talked about Phalaris.* But I'll help him out for once, and give an account of one that I very well remember. The Bookseller once asked me privately, That I would do him the favour to tell my opinion, if the new edition of *Phalaris*, then in the press, would be a vendible book? for he had a concern in the impression, and hoped it would sell well: such a great character being given of it in —— *Essays*, as made it mightily inquired after.* I told him, He would be safe enough, since he was concerned for nothing but the sale of the Book: for the great names of those that recommended it would get it many buyers. But however, under the rose, the Book was a spurious piece, and deserved not to be spread in the world by another impression. His *employment*, it seems, could suffer him to betray this discourse to some concerned in the Edition, as I was informed from a very good hand; and this I meant, when I said in my former account, *That it was my hard hap in some private conversation to say, the Epistles were spurious, and unworthy of a new edition.* What influence this might have towards the civility in the *Preface to Phalaris*, I leave others to judge. But I dare say, this was all the *reflection* that I had ever

[* *i. e.* Sir William Temple's *Essays*. See the passage quoted in the prefatory matter to this volume.—D.]

made at that time, to Mr. Boyle's disadvantage. *Si hoc peccare est, fateor.* If there be no way of gaining his good opinion, but to believe *Phalaris* a good writer, I must needs submit to my fate, that has excluded me from his friendship.

Mr. B. is pleased to observe, *That Mr. Bennet is so little interested in this dispute, that he may entirely be depended on* (p. 9). So very little; that the best part of his interest and his trade lay at stake. For is not this the plain state of the case? Mr. Boyle commits the affair of collating the King's MS. to his Bookseller. The Bookseller, by his own neglect having failed in his trust, for fear of losing the gentleman's favour and custom, lays the fault upon me. This occasioned a private grudge against me, which terminated in an affront in print. I verily believe, that the Bookseller did not think at first that Mr. Boyle would have carried his resentment so high: otherwise perhaps he would have invented some other excuse of his negligence. But the business was afterwards past recalling; and he must go on of necessity, being once engaged in the cause. The whole of his trade and business seemed to depend upon Mr. B. and his friends. The temptation indeed was strong; and I pray God forgive him.

Having now, as I humbly conceive, given a full and satisfactory answer to all the matters of fact that the Examiner's witnesses lay to my charge; I am very little concerned at the inferences he draws from them, or the satire and grimace that he plentifully sprinkles. All these must drop of themselves, and fall down upon the author of them, when the foundation that they stood on is taken away. But, however, I shall take some short notice of every thing he has said, that is not entirely included in the testimonies of his witnesses.

The Dr., says he, *seemed to be satisfied, and willing to let the dispute drop, by his not writing to me any further about it, or discoursing Mr. Bennet concerning it, to whom my Letter plainly referred him* (p. 4). The Doctor, 'tis true, was willing to *let the dispute drop;* but whether either or both of these reasons ought to have made Mr. B. suppose I was *satisfied*, I leave it to the judgment of those that

know good breeding. I had writ him, as himself owns, a *very civil* Letter (p. 19), complaining of the fraud of his Bookseller, and representing the matter quite otherwise than he had told it. After a delay of two posts, when the Books were spread abroad in the mean time, I had an answer, giving me leave to take my own satisfaction, and, as he here says, referring me to discourse with his Bookseller. Now what person of any courage or spirit, such as innocence always gives one, would either write again to Mr. B. after this repeated affront, or go with his finger in his eye to tell his story to the Bookseller, who was the principal in the injury? Mr. B. must sure have an odd *cast of his head* (p. 106), to think that I or any man else would submit to such indignities. I had done all that became me, in writing him a timely account of the whole truth, with *expressions of great civility to him* (p. 4). But, when I saw the civility of his Answer, which bid me right myself as I pleased, and referred me to his Bookseller; *I neither thought my Station so little, nor the Editor's so very great, nor the calumny so terrible, that I should make a second application after such a repulse* (p. 21). I designed indeed to *drop the dispute;* but not because I either owned or feared, but because I despised, the detraction; being conscious that it was false, and well knowing that, if ever I pleased, I could make the authors ashamed on't.

Mr. B. has such an affection for chicanery and banter, that he cannot abstain from it when he ought to be most serious. He pretends to draw up a heavy charge against me; because I say, *the Editors of Phalaris* (p. 18, 19); and, in another place, *They have collated* (p. 17). *How came I,* says he, *to be multiplied at this rate?* Well, I will submit to the chastisement of this great Aristarchus: though I thought I might have the common liberty of changing numbers, which is familiar in all the languages that I know of, either old or new. Who knows not, that *οἱ περὶ Πλάτωνα, οἱ περὶ Ἀριστοτέλη,* are often put for Plato and Aristotle alone? *As certain of your own* POETS *have said,* says the Apostle: and yet he meant

only Aratus. And how often do we say *We*, and yet speak of ourselves only; without thinking we are *multiplied;* or doubled like Sosia in Plautus's *Amphitryo!* I do not question but some example of this may be found in his own Book, if the matter were worth the search. I am sure that, in another piece of grimace, he is guilty of the very expression that he would turn to ridicule. I had said, 'Twas a surprise indeed to find there, that our MS. was not perused. *Our MS.*, says the Examiner, *that is, His Majesty's and mine. He fancies himself to have some interest in't. 'Tis like the Ego et Rex meus of Cardinal Wolsey* (p. 21). Very smart and witty! so that, by the same rule, when Mr. B. himself says, *It will be very hard upon* OUR *Sicilian Prince* (p. 43); we must interpret it, *Ego et Phalaris meus, I and my Prince Phalaris.* And when he so often says, OUR *Critic*, meaning his humble servant (p. 109, 142); the world is to take it, that he has some dominion over me; which is an honour I am not worthy of. And when I myself often say, OUR *Editors*, and OUR *Edition*, Mr. B. by this rule may infer, that I claim a share and a concern in his Edition of *Phalaris:* which I should take for a compliment more severe than any thing he has yet said on me.

There's a certain temper of mind, that Cicero[d] calls PHALARISM, *a spirit like Phalaris's;* and one would be apt to imagine that a portion of it had descended upon some of his Translators. The gentleman has given a broad hint more than once in his Book, that, if I proceed further against Phalaris, I may draw perhaps a duel or a stab upon myself. Which is a generous threat, especially to a Divine, who neither carries arms nor principles fit for that sort of controversy. 'Tis the same kind of generosity, though in a lower degree, when he forbids me *to meddle with banter and ridicule, which, even when luckily hit on, are not very suitable to my character* (p. 285). And yet the sharpest, nay almost the only arguments that he himself uses, are banter and ridi-

[d] Cic. ad Attic. vii. 12. Istum quidem, cujus Φαλαρισμὸν times, omnia teterrimè facturum puto.

cule. So that *we two*, as he says, *must end this dispute* (Preface); but he takes care to allow me none of the offensive arms that himself fights with. These are extraordinary instances, both of his candour and his courage. However, I've endeavoured to take his advice, and avoid all ridicule, where it was possible to avoid it: and if ever *that odd work of his* (p. 68) has irresistibly moved me to a little jest and laughter, I am content that what is the greatest virtue of His Book should be counted the greatest fault of Mine.

The facetious Examiner seems resolved to vie with Phalaris himself in the science of PHALARISM: for his revenge is not satisfied with one single death of his adversary, but he will kill me over and over again. He has slain me twice, by two several deaths, one in the first page of his Book, and another in the last. In the title-page, I die the death of Milo the Crotonian:

——*Remember Milo's end,*
Wedg'd in that timber, which he strove to rend.

The application of which must be this: That, as Milo after his victories at six several Olympiads was at last conquered and destroyed in wrestling with a tree; so I, after I had attained to some small reputation in Letters, am to be quite baffled and run down by wooden antagonists. But, in the end of his Book, he has got me into Phalaris's Bull: and he has the pleasure of fancying that he hears me *begin to bellow* (p. 290). Well; since it's certain then that I am in the Bull, I have performed the part of a sufferer. For as the cries of the tormented in old Phalaris's Bull, being conveyed through pipes lodged in the machine, were turned into music for the entertainment of the Tyrant; so the complaints which my torments express from me, being conveyed to Mr. B. by this Answer, are all dedicated to his pleasure and diversion. But yet, methinks, when he was setting up to be *Phalaris Junior*, the very omen of it might have deterred him. For, as the old Tyrant himself at last *bellowed* in his own Bull; so his imitators ought to consider, that

at long run their own actions may chance to overtake them.

But 'tis not enough for him that I die a bodily death, unless my reputation too die with me. He accuses me of one of the meanest and basest of actions; *That when Sir Edward Sherburn put a MS. into my hands, to get it published by Mr. Grævius; desiring me to let him know from whom he had it, that he might make an honourable mention of him; I concealed the kindness of Sir Edward, and took the honour of it to myself, so that the Book was dedicated to me, and not one word said of him.* This is both a very black and a very false accusation; and yet I own I am neither sorry nor surprised to see it in print. Not sorry, because I can so fully confute it, that with all ingenuous readers it will turn to my applause. Not surprised, because I expected such usage from the spirit of PHALARISM. I am morally sure, that the very persons that printed this story knew I could give a good answer to't: for I heard of it by some common friends some time before it was printed, who, I question not, gave them an account how I justified myself. But, however, it seems, they would not lay aside this calumny: for, as in war sometimes 'tis an useful stratagem to spread a false report, though it certainly must be disproved in two or three days; so here it was thought a serviceable falsehood, if it could be credited for a few months. Besides that it's the old rule, to accuse strenuously, and something will stick: and 'tis almost the same thing with men's reputations as with their lives; he that is prodigal of his own, is master of another man's.

I had prepared a new edition of *Manilius;* which design being known abroad occasioned my acquaintance with Sir Edward Sherburn, who had formerly translated the First Book of that Poet into English verse, and explained it with a large Commentary. He had got together some old and scarce editions, which he courteously lent me; and besides those, he had purchased at Antwerp, by the means of a bookseller, a whole box full of papers of the famous Gasper

Gevartius's, who undertook an edition of the same poet, but was prevented by death. All this mass of papers he desired me to look over, if perhaps I might find any thing that was useful to the public. Among the remains of Gevartius, I found nothing of any moment. But there was one Treatise about Theodorus Mallius, written in another hand, but without any name to't, which I thought to be considerable. And, by good fortune, among a parcel of letters, I met with one written in the same hand with that Treatise, and subscribed A. R.; and I easily guessed, by the contents of the Letter, that they meant ALBERTUS RUBENIUS. This gave me a certain discovery of the true author of that Treatise; and I immediately waited on Sir Edward, and gave him an account of it; desiring him either to send it to Oxford, to be printed among some Miscellanies; or to Utrecht, to the learned Mr. Grævius; who, having printed some Posthumous Works of the same Albertus Rubenius, was the properest hand to convey this to the world. The latter proposal being embraced, I wrote to Holland, to Mr. Grævius, giving a narrative of the whole, and promising, in the name of Sir Edward, that, if Mr. Grævius would undertake the edition, I would presently send him the Book. Within no long time, I received an answer from Mr. Grævius; where, among other things, says he, *Pray present my humble service to that learned and noble gentleman Sir Edward Sherburn; and if he pleases to commit Rubenius to my care, I will immediately put it to the press, and let the Learned World know to whose kindness they are obliged. I had never heard of his Commentary upon the First Book of Manilius: but, since you give such a character of it, I am sure it must needs be good, and therefore I will purchase it.* I shewed this letter to Sir Edward; and so the Book was sent to Holland by a safe hand.

The very next letter that I received from Mr. Grævius was accompanied with half a dozen printed copies of Rubenius. I was much surprised to see the Book printed so soon; but more, when I saw a Dedication to myself; which

was an honour that I should not have expected, if I had been not only the discoverer, but the possessor too of the MS. But it troubled me exceedingly, when I found not the least mention of Sir Edward Sherburn there; and I expressed my concern about it to several friends. Particularly the Right Reverend the Bishop of Norwich,* whom I do myself the honour to name here, will bear me witness, how extremely I was concerned at it, when I presented him one of the copies. And some time after, when his Lordship sent to Mr. Grævius by my means a Collation of the Philosophical Works of Cicero from a very ancient and excellent MS. (for, as his Lordship has one of the best libraries of England, so he is as free in communicating it); I appeal to Mr. Grævius himself, who has yet perhaps that Letter by him, if I did not wish him to take care, not to ascribe that favour to me; and not to forget to name his Lordship, as he had formerly forgot Sir Edward Sherburn. Another of the copies of Rubenius I presented to Sir Edward himself; and both lamented to him and excused Mr. Grævius's oversight, that he had dedicated that to me, which was rather due to Sir Edward. As for myself, I had no manner of need to make apology to Sir Edward, since he had read Mr. Grævius's own letter, where he voluntarily promised to make honourable mention of him; and would certainly have done it, if the multiplicity of his studies and other affairs had not quite struck it out of his mind. I might appeal to Sir Edward's own memory for the truth of all this: but that his exceeding old age,† and the infirmities that attend it, make him an incompetent witness: and upon that account I heartily excuse and forgive him all that his weakness has furnished to the malice of some others.

The Examiner has represented, as if the good word, that Mr. Grævius has been pleased publicly to give me, was solely bottomed upon that which I falsely assumed to myself, the publication of Rubenius. 'Tis necessary therefore to give

[* Dr. John Moore, translated to Ely in 1707.—*Note on ed.* 1777.]

[† He was born Sept. 18, 1618; and died Nov. 4, 1702.—*Note on id.*]

the reader here as much of that Dedication as concerns me and that affair; that he may see whether such a stress is laid upon that favour, as, if that belong to another man, my little reputation must all drop with it.

Viro Cl. Richardo Bentleio S.P.D.

Joannes Georgius Grævius.

Redit ad te, quam mihi dono miseras, Alberti Rubenii commentatio de Theodoro Mallio sanè quàm docta et polita. Pro quâ, cùm illam mecum communicare voluisti, non possum non tibi et meo et rei literariæ nomine gratias agere publicè.—Plurimum igitur tibi debebunt manes Rubenii, si quis manium sensus est, qui tam egregiam ejus diatriben ex tenebris, in quibus, absque te fuisset, perpetuò quasi sepulta jacuisset, in dias luminis auras protraxisti.—Nec manes tantùm Rubenii, sed omnes humanitatis cultores tibi pro hoc in se merito devinxisti. Hi nunc tuas curas in Manilium, Hesychium, aliosque scriptores desiderant et expectant cupidè. Nam eruditissima illa Epistola, quam subtexuisti Malalæ Chronicis, tam multa recondita nos docuit, ut incredibilem expectationem tui ingenii commoverit. Nihil nobis longius est, nihil desideratius, quàm ut illa videamus, quorum spem fecisti, cùm publicè omnibus, tum mihi de tuis in Callimacho Animadversionibus, quarum pulcherrimum specimen mihi misisti. Hanc ut propediem expleas, Vir Eximie, Deum precor, ut salvus, incolumis, felix ætatem agas, meque tui studiosissimum amare pergas.*

Now the whole that Mr. Grævius says here, or could say of me, in relation to the publishing Rubenius, is this, *That himself in particular, and all the lovers of polite learning, and the very author Rubenius (if the dead have any knowledge of what's done here), give me thanks for retrieving the MS.* But for the rest of the Dedication, I humbly conceive, the character he has there given of me has another foundation. I implore here the reader's candour, that he

[* Grævius wrote "subnexuisti:" see Ded. to *Rub. Diss.* &c. 1694, 12mo.—D.]

would not believe me so vain, as to assume the commendations that Mr. Grævius and some other eminent persons have given me (to encourage, as I suppose, my beginnings), as if they really were deserved by me. But I mention them here on this occasion, to shew that some of the learnedest men of the age have either more candour, or another kind of judgment, than Mr. B. and his party. Mr. B. is pleased somewhere to send me to Hermogenes's Chapter,[e] *Περὶ τοῦ ἀνεπαχθῶς ἑαυτὸν ἐπαινεῖν, How a man may commend himself, without envy or fulsomeness.* And I find there, that one may safely do it, *when detraction and calumny make it necessary.*

Nay, I may freely say, that I deserve almost as well of the memory of Rubenius, as if all the honour, which they pretend I robbed Sir Edward of, had been truly my own. Neither is there one single word, that Mr. Grævius says of me with respect to Rubenius, that is not literally true. For it was I that *communicated the MS. to him;* it was I that *brought it out of that darkness, where without me it might have been buried for ever.* For Sir Edward had been possessor of Gevartius's papers for several years; but he knew no more of that Treatise, and especially who was the author of it, than if it never had been written. Nay, if I had been such a plagiary as Mr. B. would traduce me for, I had it wholly in my power, not only to rob Sir Edward, but Rubenius himself, of the honour of that Treatise. For Sir Edward intrusted me with the whole box of papers, whereof he knew little or nothing, without either numbering or weighing them. So that I could easily have kept back that little Treatise without giving him any notice of it, and have published it afterwards as my own work. And this alone is a sufficient disproof of this malicious calumny. For how is it credible, since I was so ingenuous as to make discovery of a paper which I could have concealed as my own; that at the same time I could be so senselessly dishonest as to seek to

[e] Hermog. p. 429.

rob him of that little *honour* of being master of another man's work many years without knowing what it was?

When I first met with this accusation in print, it seemed the easiest way of confuting it, to produce Mr. Grævius's letter; where, in answer to mine, he had thanked Sir Edward for the hopes he had given him of the MS., and promised to do him right in the publication. So that presently I looked among my papers; but, to my grief, I could not find it by the most diligent search. The next thing was, to produce my own letter to Mr. Grævius, where I myself had made *honourable mention* of Sir Edward and his intended kindness. But I had not that letter in my power; for I writ that, as I do others, but once over, without keeping any copy of it. The only reserve then that I had left, was to write to Mr. Grævius; and to desire a copy of his former letter, if perhaps he had a transcript of it; or that he would send me either a copy or the original of my letter, if such a trifle, by good providence, should still be in being; or at least that he would now do me right by a new letter, since he could not but remember, when put in mind of it, that I had sent him Rubenius as Sir Edward Sherburn's Book, and not as my own. And in answer I received a letter, part of which I here publish without varying a word. And I must own myself obliged to Mr. B. that he was pleased to start this calumny so early, while all the parties are still alive to disprove it.

Joannes Georgius Grævius S. P. D.

Richardo Bentleio.

Literis tuis, quas Februario superiore dedisti ad me, quamvis nihil iis acceptius et optatius mihi potuit afferri, serius respondeo; non quòd immemor fuerim officii, sed quòd Epistolam illam, quâ nonnulla fragmentis Callimachi adjici volebas, quæ ego Proœmio inserui, cùm jam omnia cætera typis essent descripta, diù frustrà quæsivi. Nec enim exputare possum, unde illa, quæ tua negas esse, excerpserim. Itaque

non putabam me ante tibi posse satisfacere, quàm illam inspexissem epistolam, et num me mei oculi, aut memoria fefellerit, inde cognovissem. Quamvis verò mihi non perierit, qui omnia tua custodio diligentius nigris uvis, nescio tamen in quem se angulum bibliothecæ abdiderit, ex quo nondum potuit erui. Nunc visâ tuâ novissimâ epistolâ, quam pridie, cùm ex itinere menstruo ferè domum revertissem, inveni domi meæ; diutius cessandum non duxi. Ad priores, pro quibus tibi δίδακτρον debeo, brevi respondebo. Jam ad has, quas xxix. Aprilis exarâsti, hæc habe.

In literis, quas Londini in ædibus Episcopi Wigorniensis scripseras iv. Julii, 1692, *hæc tu ad me: 'Est* apud nos 'Edvardus Sherburnus, Eques Auratus, qui librum primum 'Manilii Anglicè vertit, et commentario doctissimo auxit. Is 'abhinc annis aliquot apparatum Gasp. Gevartii ad Manilium 'ab ejus hærede emit Antwerpiæ, mihique non ita pridem, quem 'novam ejus scriptoris editionem parare inaudiverat, schedas 'Gevartianas perlegendi copiam fecit. Comperi autem Virum 'Clarissimum omnem operam in eo posuisse, non qui Manilii 'textum corrigeret, vel illustraret, sed qui infelicem suam (mea 'quidem sententia) conjecturam de Theodoro Mallio Cos. quem 'Astronomici† auctorem esse voluit, adversùs Barthios et Salmasios et Tristanos et Possinos defenderet. Nihil tamen in 'medium profert, quod momenti habeat quicquam ad opinionem 'suam stabiliendam, præterquam quæ dudum in lucem ediderat 'in Papinianis et Variis Lectionibus. Itaque cùm toties repetita crambe‡ mihi fastidium moveret, mirificè tamen recreatus 'sum aureolis duabus Epistolis, quæ in isto chartarum fasce 'latitabant, quæque celeberrimum Grævii nomen ferebant inscriptum. Illud verò me perculisse fateor, quod ad Gevartii 'sententiam de ætate Manilii videris§ accedere:' et quæ sequuntur de hâc‖ opinione Gevartii, quam damnas. Post hæc*

[* "*Est* quidam." *Bent. Ep.* (*Burney*), p. 1.—D.]
[† "Astronomiæ." *Id.* p. 103.—D.]
[‡ "nauseam *mihi* et *fastidium*." *Id.* p. 2. and p. 103.—D.]
[§ "videaris." *Id.* p. 2. and p. 104.—D.]
[‖ "*hâc*"—not in *id.* p. 104.—D.]

addis: 'Erat autem præterea quod me Adversaria ista versantem non mediocri voluptate affecit, Dissertatio scilicet benè longa et perquam erudita de vitâ Fl. Mallii Theodori Cos. auctore, ut casu comperi, Alberto Rubenio, cujus Opuscula Posthuma, te obstetricante, in lucem prodierunt. Hanc meo judicio minime dignam, quæ cum blattis et tineis diutius conflictetur, curabo tibi mittendam, si ejus editionem te procuraturum fore polliceris; et quidem vel unà cum aliis quibusdam, vel etiam sola non incommodè edi poterit.'*

Hæc αὐτολεξεὶ in epistolâ tuâ, ex quibus luce meridianâ clarius patet, non tuam, sed meam culpam esse, quòd, cùm Commentationem Rubenianam ederem, non meminerim hujus epistolæ, et propterea non debitas gratias persolverim Viro Nobilissimo Edvardo Sherburno pro communicato cum utroquè nostrûm hoc Rubenii libello. Ipse aut negligentiam aut oblivionem meam detestor, et culpam deprecor. Meæ responsionis nullum servavi exemplum, æquè ut nec aliarum. Illud memini me Sherburni Manilium, quem ex tuâ epistolâ cognovi planè mihi ante ignotum, sæpè desiderásse.—

Vale†—et tibi persuade, te doctos omnes viros maximi facere, rumpantur ut ilia Codris; *sed neminem esse qui te majoris faciat, et magis æstimet quàm ego te facio.*

After this letter of Mr. Grævius's, I suppose there needs nothing more to silence this sorry calumny. He has exscribed the words of my own letter, which in the plainest expressions declare, *that the MS. was Sir Edward Sherburn's; that he had lent me it to read over; and if Mr. Grævius would promise to publish it, it should be put into his hands.* And though he has no transcript of that letter which he sent me in answer to mine, where he returned Sir Edward thanks, and promised to do it publicly; yet he very well remembers it, and, upon the whole, avers, *that it was his fault, and not mine,* that Sir Edward was not

[* "etiam." *Id.* p. 3.—D.]

[† The words omitted here are "Vir magne." See *id.* p. 106.—D.]

mentioned; and he *asks pardon for the omission, whether it happened through negligence or through forgetfulness.*

The first part of Mr. Grævius's letter relates to another affair, that Mr. B. is not concerned in: and yet it is not so wide from the present case, as not to deserve a place here. Mr. Grævius, in his Preface to the late Edition of Callimachus, has these words: *In epigrammate* XLIX. *Bentleianæ συναγωγῆς versum secundum sic legendum esse postea nobis scripsit celeberrimus Bentleius,*

*Τῷῤῥα μένων αἰγᾶν οὐ καθιμᾶσ' ὁ Κύκλωψ,**

et sic vertendum,

Illic manens capras non dimisit Cyclops;

Hoc est, gregem non dimisit ex pascuis suo tempore: Τῷῤῥα. Hesych. Τῷ ῥα, διὸ δή. Idem, Τὸ ῥα, ὅπερ δή.

When I read this passage first, it was a very great surprise, to find a correction ascribed to me, as communicated by my own letter; which I could not remember one syllable of, and which in every part of it is quite against my own judgment. As the first word *Τῷῤῥα* is falsely translated *Illic;* and the translation is falsely justified out of Hesychius: for Hesychius interprets it *διὸ δή, i. e. quamobrem,* and *ὅπερ δή, i. e. quod quidem;* and what do those two words relate to *Illic?* Then the third word *αἰγᾶν* seems to be set there as a Doricism for *αἰγῶν.*† But the Dorians

[* This line has occasioned various conjectures. See *Callim. ed. Blomf.* p. 161. note.—D.]

[† Theocritus has *τᾶν αἰγᾶν*, Idyll. VIII. 49, if it be not a false print. SALTER. *Ad. note on ed.* 1777.—In Eurip. *Hecuba*, v. 1053, Porson gives *τᾶνδε γυναικῶν*, observing, "*γυναικῶν* Ald. Quanquam plerumque proniores sunt librarii ad delenda quàm retinenda dialectorum discrimina, aliquando tamen, ut nunc, nimio Dorismi studio peccare videas." To this remark of Porson, Schæfer appends Bentley's observation, "The Dorians never turn *ων* into *αν*," &c. and Salter's note; and then adds: "Legebatur item Idyll. v. 148. Sed utrobique Kiesslingius correxit. Idem, sed invectum illud ex emendatione, reperias etiam in Epigramm. adesp. XL. 2. In Euripidis Hel. v. 385, Aldina item habet *θηρᾶν*, quod Musgraviana invito, opinor, editore retinuit. Idem è Pindari Isthm. iv. 78, expulit Heynius, quem vide."—D.]

never turn ων into αν in that declension: for they say τᾶν φρενῶν, not τᾶν φρενᾶν. And the fifth word καθιμᾶσ' has no fewer than three faults in it: first it should be accented καθίμασε, and not καθιμᾶσε; then the syllable θι here is made short in the measure; but it's always long, as appears in Aristophanes and others; then it's translated here *dimisit, dismissed;* but it truly signifies *demisit, he let down by a rope.* Besides all these verbal faults, the whole sentence is flat, and unworthy of Callimachus. I declare therefore that I never wrote this, and I utterly disown the whole. And in the copies that I presented soon after the publication to some Right Honourable persons, whom I will not name upon so slight an occasion, they will find my name in that place blotted out, and the correction left to its unknown author.

This mistake of Mr. Grævius's was one of the subjects of that letter of mine, which he answers here in the first paragraph of his. He says, *He sought a long time for that letter, where (as he thought) I gave direction to insert this emendation: but it could no where be found.* No wonder indeed, that it was sought *in vain;* for there was no such letter written by me. But Mr. Grævius, as it seems, by a very natural and very pardonable failing, had forgot who it was that had sent him that correction. He might have a schedule of it enclosed in a letter; and if the letter and the schedule were parted, 'twas a very easy mistake to ascribe it to a wrong author. And I heartily excuse this little oversight in that excellent person; as I doubt not but he will excuse this freedom, that I publicly disclaim that correction. For, as his incomparable learning will not allow the least suspicion that the correction could be his own; so his singular ingenuity and candour will allow me the liberty to renounce what is not mine. But I would crave leave to make two inferences from this, with relation to the Examiner. First, I humbly conceive, here's a case exactly parallel with that of Sir Edward Sherburn's. And if such a mistake happened without my knowledge in the

edition of Callimachus; the same thing might happen in the edition of Rubenius. And, secondly, we have a singular instance here of Mr. B.'s great capacity to be a censurer of my writings; who, though he read (as appears from his Book) my Notes on Callimachus, and my Dissertation on Jo. Antiochensis, on purpose to find faults in them, was not able to discover the mistakes of this passage, that lay so thick and so open.

I cannot omit this opportunity of correcting and explaining one of the Epigrams of that Poet:[f]

Τὴν ἁλίην Εὔδημος, ἐφ' ἧς ἅλα λιτὸν ἐπελθὼν,
Χειμῶνας μεγάλους ἐξέφυγεν δανέων,
Θῆκε θεοῖς Σαμόθραξι· λέγων ὅτι τήνδε κατ' εὐχὴν,
Ὦ λαοὶ, σωθεὶς ἐξ ἁλὸς ὧδ' ἔθετο.

Where the MS. reading *ἐπελθὼν* betrayed not only myself, but the most ingenious and learned Madam Dacier into a mistake. We took *ἅλα* here to mean *the sea*, and consequently *ἁλίην a ship:* and the *Samothracian Gods* seemed to require that interpretation, for they were supposed to deliver from storms at sea. But I have since discovered, that the Epigram has quite another meaning. *Ἁλίη* signifies *a salt-cellar*, and *ἅλα salt*. And the first verse is to be corrected thus:

Τὴν ἁλίην Εὔδημος, ἐφ' ἧς ἅλα λιτὸν ἐπέσθων.

And the whole to be thus translated:

Salinum Eudemus, in quo salem tenuem comedens
Procellas magnas effugit usurarum,
Donavit Diis Samothracibus; dicens, quod hoc ex voto,
O populi, servatus à sale hic posuit.

Eudemus here in the Epigram, owing a great many debts, paid them off by living sparingly upon bread and salt, the diet of poor people: and in memory of it he de-

[f] Callimachus, Epig. LI. [=50. p. 66. *ed. Blomf.*—D.]

dicated his salt-cellar to the Samothracian Gods. The Epigram is very ingenious, and the humour of it lies in the double meaning of *ἁλίην* and *ἅλα* and *ἁλὸς*, and the likeness of *ἐπέσθων* to *ἐπελθὼν*, and of *δανέων* to *ἀνέμων*. And the whole is a *Parodia*. Suidas* quotes a part of it, and from him I had the hint of this true and certain explication. *Ἐπέσθων*, says he, *ἐπεσθίων, εὐωχούμενος. Τὴν ἁλίην Εὔδημος, ἐφ' ἧς ἅλα λιτὸν ἐπέσθων χειμῶνας μεγάλους ἐξέφυγε, θῆκε θεοῖς Σαμόθραξιν.* The word *δανέων* is omitted in Suidas; but there's no question now but it's the true reading. If Mr. B., when he searched my writings to pick holes in them, had but corrected this one Epigram; which none of us that were concerned in Callimachus then understood; he had done himself more true honour by this single improvement, as slight as it is, than he has done by his whole Book.

But to return to the affair of Sir Edward Sherburn; the Examiner now proceeds to fortify his accusation, and secure it against all exceptions. *But Grævius*, says he, *it may be, was in fault, and forgot to do Sir Edward justice* (p. 16). Is it so then? *May it be* that Mr. Grævius was in fault? Had I not reason to say above, that I was well assured the authors of this calumny were conscious that the blame was Mr. Grævius's? And is not this fencing and supposing of theirs a plain indication of it? *But 'tis hardly to be imagined*, says he, *that Grævius could forget it, had the Dr. told him plainly, that the MS. was put into his hands under that express condition.* True indeed! if Mr. Grævius had no more business on his hands, than the Examiner and his Assistant have. But a man that considers both the great variety and great importance of Mr. Grævius's own affairs would not wonder, if he had forgot, not only to mention Sir Edward Sherburn (whom he had never heard of but once in my letter), but to publish the very MS. itself. But, with the Examiner's good leave, there was no need at all either

[* I. 1333. *ed. Graef.*—D.]

of *intimating it slightly*, or *telling it plainly*, to Mr. Grævius. He does not want any spur to make him own his obligations. I had no occasion to make either slight or broad *intimations*, what Sir Edward expected: for Mr. Grævius had promised of his own accord, before the book was sent him, that he would do Sir Edward justice. 'Tis true, I cannot produce Mr. Grævius's letter, because I have unfortunately lost it, and he has no transcript of it. But the Right Reverend the Bishop of Norwich, who gives me leave to say this in his name, remembers very well, that I shewed him the letter, and that Mr. Grævius there returned his thanks to Sir Edward, and promised to inform the world who it was that obliged it.

But suppose, says he, *the omission lay wholly at Grævius's door; why did not the Dr. send immediately to Sir Edward to excuse it* (p. 16)? See here the true spirit of PHALARISM. 'Tis no matter whether a thing be true or false, so it make for their purpose. I did more than *send*, for I *went* immediately to Sir Edward, to excuse it; which, by his carriage then and some time after, I thought I had done effectually; and I presented him then with one of the copies Mr. Grævius had sent me. Nay I am morally sure, it was in that very book which I had given him, that he *entered the memorandum*, which the Examiner produces (p. 15).

And why, says he, *did not the Dr. take care to have this neglect repaired in the next Holland Journal* (p. 16)? A most wonderful expedient! 'Twas a thing indeed of great consequence to the world, to know whose box it was that had preserved the MS. And yet, as mean as the thing was, and as little as the honour of it was; I had resolved and engaged to Sir Edward, to do him that right in a fitter place than a *Holland Journal*. I had then prepared a Manilius for the press, which had been published already, had not the dearness of paper and the want of good types, and some other occasions, hindered. And I assured Sir Edward, that in that book I would make him amends for Mr. Grævius's omission. For I had occasion there to have thanked him

upon another account; which I will now mention, that I may be quite out of his debt. Among those papers, I found a Discourse of the learned Godefridus Wendelinus's, about the age of the poet Manilius. There were two copies of it, one by Wendelinus's own hand, and the other by Gevartius's: and Sir Edward was pleased to give me one of them; because I purposed either to print the whole, or give an extract of it, in my edition of Manilius. I return him here my acknowledgments for it; but let Manilius come out when it will, the world I believe will excuse me, if I think I have now paid as much as I owe him.

The Examiner goes on in the honourable work of false accusation. *A Foreigner*, says he, *of great note complained how ill the Dr. had used him, in a case near resembling mine: which not yet having his leave for it, I do not think myself at liberty to publish* (p. 14). The short of which is, *That somebody complained of something which Mr. B. will not tell.* I must own, when I read such stuff as this set out in the name of Mr. B., I am forced to suspect, do what I can, that there are more forgeries than *Phalaris's Letters.* Mr. B. must forgive me, if I think this paragraph more becomes the *Humty-dumty** Author, than a gentleman of sense and honour. If such loose and general accusations must pass for evidence, who can be innocent? When the Examiner is *at liberty to publish* this story, I make no question but I shall prove it as false as his calumny about Sir Edward. In the mean time, he has shewn his proficiency in the noble science of detraction, when, under pretence of saying nothing, he says more than all. For he insinuates a blind story about *something* and *somebody*, which the reader is to guess at, and make as black as he pleases. I remember, a certain Foreigner, whose name I have now forgot, made the modest and reasonable demand, that I would give him the Alexandrian MS. to his lodgings, to be collated quite through, which would require half a year's

[* See note (*), p. xxi.—D.]

constant labour. It was pretty hard to keep one's countenance at so senseless a proposal: however, I gave him a civil answer, why I thought the favour could not be allowed him. If this be the *man that complained to Mr. B. how ill I had used him*, as the circumstances make it probable; I do not envy Mr. B. the honour of his acquaintance of *great note*.

But another, it seems, *applied to Dr. Bentley for a sight of the Alexandrian MS., and met with no other answer, but that the Library was not fit to be seen* (p. 14). Here's another general accusation without naming the person, and upon that account not easy to be disproved: but, however, it has the common fate of all his stories and arguments, that they are false, and so may be turned upon himself. For, ever since I came to St. James's, I have constantly kept that MS. in my own lodgings, for this very reason, *that persons might see it without seeing the Library*. I believe there are a hundred now in England, that have seen the MS. since I had the custody of it: and I appeal to all their memories, if they did not see it in my lodgings, and not in the Library.

But let us see the Examiner's Comment upon't: *A pretty excuse*, says he, (that the Library was not fit to be seen) *for a Library-keeper to make, who had been four years in that service!* (p. 15.) That I could not make this excuse for not shewing the Alexandrian MS., I suppose it's already sufficiently clear. But I will own, that I have often said and lamented, *that the Library was not fit to be seen*. If he thinks this such a reproach to the Library-keeper, he has free liberty to make the best on't. But upon whom would this reflection fall, were it really a matter of reproach? Our keen Examiner should look before him a little; and not blindly throw about his abuses without minding whom they will hit. If the room be too mean, and too little for the books; if it be much out of repair; if the situation be inconvenient; if the access to it be dishonourable; is the Library-keeper to answer for't? Would he have me, *in the four years of that service*, to have erected a new Library at my own charge? But there's nothing really to be blamed

here, but the Examiner's pertness. For the expenses and toils of a long war are but too just an excuse, that the thoughts of a new Library were not part of the public cares: but there's no question, but a few years of peace under his Majesty's most happy government will set us above this reproach.

These, I think, are all the personal accusations in the Examiner's Preamble; let us now take a short view of his complaints against my Book. The first is, That I insinuate there, that the translation of *Phalaris* was not his own; for I said, it was *ascribed* to him, and his *name was set to the Edition*, and *the faults in't were no disparagement to him, but to his teachers;* and I call them, in the plural number, *Editors, Annotators*, and *great Geniuses*.

These are all the passages in my Book, that are or can be brought to make out this indictment. Now the two first of these expressions are very far from affirming that he was not the true author. For this present Book is *ascribed* to me, and my name is *set* to the Edition; and yet, I assure him, 'tis my own. It must be the third then of those phrases, *that the faults were a disparagement to his teachers*, which must imply they were not his. But, with humble submission, whether this inference be his or his teachers', 'tis a weak one. For he himself owns, that he was then very *young*, and not only had a *Tutor*,* but a *Director of his studies;* and, in that case, the *faults* might be really his own, but the *disparagement* theirs that suffered them to pass. In his Dedication there, he tells the Tutor, that he was *assisted by him in the work:*[g] and in his Preface here, he says, *The Director was consulted by him upon* ANY *difficulty*. After such a public declaration, the world will still be of my opinion, that both the Tutor and the Director were accountable for the faults in *Phalaris*, though they were really the pupil's. Mr. B. indeed, in his Preface here, seems to excuse the

[* Dr. Aldrich, Dean of Christ Church.—*Note on ed.* 1777.]

[g] "Opus tuâ ope adjutum."

Tutor; for he declares, *That, excepting the Director, no one had a hand in't; nay, scarce a line,* says he, *was ever seen by any body else as I know of, till it was finished* (Pref. p. 5). But, if this be so, how came he to thank the Tutor for *assisting the work?* Let the reader please to try if he can bring these two passages to meet; for my own part, I have seen so many contradictions between the Latin *Phalaris* and the English *Examination,* that I dare not attempt to reconcile them. But Mr. B. himself offers to do it, when he tells us, that the Tutor *might otherwise assist him in the Edition, than by collating MSS., translating the Text, and writing Comments* (p. 199). True; he might so: he might be at some charge of the printing, and make the Book his worthy New-year's gift to the Scholars of his house. But Mr. B. here answers to a question, that never was asked him. For the query is not, whether the Tutor was to *translate* or *comment;* but whether he was not to *revise* and *correct.*

Since it's hard therefore to believe both passages together, I had rather believe the English one, that the Tutor *had no hand* in the version of *Phalaris.* For the world will own, that he has more wit, more learning, and more judgment, than to let such a translation go through his hands. Much less can I think him concerned in the English *Examination,* which is the faultiest book in its kind (which is *critical*) that has appeared upon the Theatre of Learning this two hundred years. If my Answer here do not shew it to be so, let not this character be regarded: but I know already by experiment, that the best judges are satisfied I have proved it so; and the rest of the world will by degrees follow their sentiment. I must own, therefore, that the deserved reputation of the Tutor acquits him from all suspicion, that he had a hand in the *Examination.* There is only one thing, that his friends want and desire in him, that he would not suffer some under his discipline, by entering into a kind of faction in behalf of a very sorry Book, [to] give occasion to a rumour that nearly concerns his and the whole Society's honour.

As for the *Director of studies*, I entirely agree with Mr. B. that he might *consult him upon* ANY *difficulty*; and yet all the errors of the Version might pass him, or be made by him. He is of the same size for learning with the late Editor* of the *Æsopean Fables*. If they can but make a tolerable copy of verses with two or three small faults in it, they must presently set up to be authors; to bring the nation into contempt abroad, and themselves into it at home. This *Director* is he, who has lately set out *Ovid's Metamorphoses*,[h] with a Paraphrase and Notes: which I did but once dip in, and presently found these two instances of his great sense and learning. The passages are in the speech of Ulysses:

> *Cujus equos pretium pro nocte poposcerat hostis,*
> *Arma negate mihi, fueritque benignior Ajax.*[i]

That is, *Dolon was to have Achilles's horses, for being scout one single night: I, that took and defeated Dolon, demand but Achilles's armour, which is of far less value than his horses. If you deny me that,* fuerit benignior Ajax, *even Ajax himself, as much as he is my enemy, would reward my services more generously.* But the Director thus paraphrases it: FUERITQUE BENIGNIOR AJAX. *Sitque melius de vobis meritus Ajax quàm ego.* But how comes *benignior* to signify *melius meritus?* He has put such stuff here upon the Poet, as makes him neither talk Latin nor sense. But let us see another instance:

> *Reppulit Actorides sub imagine tutus Achillis*
> *Troas ab arsuris cum defensore carinis.*[j]

Patroclus, says the Poet, *being disguised in Achilles's armour, repulsed the Trojans from our ships: which otherwise would have been burnt with those that defended them. Defensore*

[* Anthony Alsop, who published, at Oxford, in 1698, *Fabularum Æsopicarum Delectus*: he sneers at Bentley in the Preface, and alludes to his refusal of the *MS. Phalaris* to Boyle in the concluding fable, *Canis in Præsepi.* — D.]

[h] Oxon. Theat. 1696. [The editor was John Freind. — D.]

[i] Lib. xiii. v. 253.

[j] Ibid. v. 273.

here, by a change of number familiar among poets, means *defensoribus*, the Grecians, who fought on shipboard, and, by consequence, had the ships been burnt, they also had been burnt with them.* But our Paraphrast tacks the words thus together; TROAS CUM DEFENSORE, *Trojanos cum Hectore eorum propugnatore;* which is silly and absurd, upon all accounts: for why should Hector be called the *defender* here, when it was he that made the *attack?* and why should the words, if the meaning of them was as the *Director* has given it, be so disjointed from one another? Besides, that the whole thought, as he has made it, is poor and flat; and more becoming his own poems than Ovid's. And is not this man now a fit *Director of studies?* Is he not a rare instructor to a young gentleman of a noble family and excellent parts; who, if he had never fallen into such hands, would have been thought to have deserved to fall into better?

But to return to Mr. B.'s complaints: if neither *ascribing*, nor *setting the name*, nor *disparagement to his teachers*, imply that I thought his Book was not writ by himself; the only words that can be accused of implying it are *Editors, Annotators, and great Geniuses*, all in the plural number. But I have given my own answer[k] already to this point, and now I'll give Mr. B.'s. He is pleased to confess, That the *Director was consulted upon* ANY *difficulty:* so that we have two at least concerned in the Edition of *Phalaris;* unless Mr. B. will wholly exclude himself. Had I really therefore understood those words in the plural acceptation, I had implied nothing but what Mr. B. admits to be true. But why must my words be stretched so far,

[* Here Dr. B. is as much mistaking as John Freind, whom he is exposing. *Defensore* means Ajax only; who had boasted, that he had sustained Hector's fire, and secured the fleet from it; which Ulysses ran away from. See this observed from Mr. Sam. Hoadly in Clarke's note on Homer, Il. II. 126. SALTER. *Ad. note on ed.* 1777.—Yet Clarke allows that the meaning which Bentley gives to *cum defensore* is "sententia nequaquam quidem aut inepta aut inconcinna." Hoadly was not the first person who applied the words to Ajax.—D.]

[k] Page xxiv.

when they may fairly be supposed to mean but one person? For even Mr. B. in his Preface to *Phalaris* says, QUANTUM SCIMUS, *as much as* WE *know*, and NOSTRO LABORE, *by* OUR *labour* (p. 198); and yet he avers he speaks of none but himself. And why then might not I mean him only by *Editors* and *Annotators?* As if it were unusual for the plural number to be put for the singular! (p. 199.)

I am clear, therefore, of this accusation of robbing Mr. B. of the right he has to his *Phalaris*. And if the world has generally believed that somebody assisted him in't; my Book is not to answer for't. On the contrary, 'twas the rumour that had already obtained in the world, that made my words be so interpreted. For I had left the thing loose and indefinite, neither denying nor affirming that Mr. B. was the author. And his true friends took hold of that handle, which was given out of kindness; and they believed it was more for his honour to renounce the Edition, than to assume it with all its faults. Mr. B. has been pleased to take the other way, and to vindicate it for his own; and the success that he has had may be now seen by the event. He has heard more than once from the press, what the world believes in that matter. And I'm afraid, he has more contributed to that belief by his second performance, than he did by his first. For a man that entitles himself to such a motley heterogeneous piece, that's not only inconsistent with his first work, but with itself; that has such variety of styles in't, as like one another as fustian is to silk; that is sometimes above and sometimes below itself in the several degrees of ignorance and banter; a man, I say, that *merrily represents* himself to be such a linsey-wolsey writer, seems to be of Planudes's humour; *for nobody can ever be silly enough to imagine it, nor can Planudes himself dream of being thus far credited* (p. 273).

Mr. B. goes on to accuse me, that I have given him very ill language; for I call the story in his Preface, a *calumny, weak detraction, injustice, forgery, slander, and vile aspersion.* These are the flowers, he says, *that I have strewed through-*

out every page almost in the Epistle (p. 11). Now this *every page almost* seems very nearly related to his Bookseller's *nine months;* for of CLII. pages, which that Epistle consists of, there are not above a dozen that in the least concern Mr. B. or his edition. But to the rest of the indictment I must plead guilty; for I own I then gave those titles of honour to his story, and have repeated some of them now: and whether I have miscalled it, the world will be judge. But it is not that I have any love or fondness to those expressions: I am more sorry that I had occasion to say them, than Mr. B. can be to hear them. But, if Mr. B. will do an *ill thing,* he must excuse me if I give it its *true,* and consequently an *ill, name.* If he give himself the liberty to say what he pleases, he must expect a return of what will not please himself. The Comic Poet's rule is the common law in those cases:

*Si mihi pergit quæ vult dicere, ea quæ non vult audiet.**

But he says, *I charge him with the basest tricks* (p. 11); which if it were true, I confess I should be ashamed of: for, were it never so much deserved, that language is too coarse to be given by me. But, if the reader pleases to consult the place, he will presently see a *trick* in this accusation. For my words are nothing but a translation of Mr. B.'s Latin *moribus nequissimis;* and they are not applied to Mr. B., but to one Alcibous in the Epistles, who is represented there as a very great knave.

And *by the help,* he says, *of a Greek proverb, I call him downright ass* (p. 11). After I had censured a passage of Mr. B.'s translation that has no affinity with the original, *This puts me in mind,* said I, *of the old Greek proverb, that Leucon carries one thing, and his Ass quite another.* Where the *Ass* is manifestly spoken of the *Sophist,* whom I had before represented as *an Ass under a Lion's skin.* And if Mr. B. has such a dearness for his Phalaris, that he'll change places with him there, how can I help it? I can

[* Ter. *Andr.* v. iv. 17.—D.]

only protest that I put him into Leucon's place; and, if he will needs compliment himself out of it, *I must leave the two friends to the pleasure of their mutual civilities* (p. 25).

But is this Mr. B.'s way of interpreting similitudes? are the things from whence they are taken to be directly applied to the persons they are spoken of? If I liken an ill Critic to a *bungling Tinker, that makes two holes, while he mends one* (p. 11); must I be charged with calling him Tinker? At this rate, Homer will call his heroes, Wolves, Boars, Dogs, and Bulls. And when Horace has this comparison about himself,

Demitto auriculas, ut iniquæ mentis Asellus,[1]

Mr. B. may tell him, *he calls himself downright Ass.* But he must be put in mind of the English proverb, that *similitudes,* even when they are taken from Asses, *do not walk upon all four.*

I will here crave the reader's leave to make one general apology for any thing, either in my *Dissertation* or my *Defence* of it, that may seem too severe. I desire but this favour, or justice rather, that he would suppose my case to be his own: and then, if he will say sincerely, that he should have answered so many calumnies with fewer marks of resentment, I am content to lie under his censure. But it's a very difficult thing, for a person unconcerned, and out of the reach of harm, to be a fair arbitrator here. He will be apt to think the injured party too angry; because he cannot have as great a passion in seeing the ill usage, as the other has in feeling it. Even Job himself, with all his patience, was accused of losing his temper, by his companions that had no share in his sufferings. Besides, there's a common fault in human nature, which I crave leave to express in Greek, *ἐπιχαιρεκακία.* There's a secret pleasure, they say, in seeing another man under the risk of a shipwreck, while one's self is safe on the shore; and so we

[1] Hor. Sat. I. IX. [20.—D.]

find the world is delighted to see one worried and run down, while themselves are made the spectators, and entertained with the diversion. 'Twas an excellent saying of Solon's, and worthy of the wisest of the famous Seven; who, when he was asked, *Πῶς ἥκιστα ἀδικοῖεν οἱ ἄνθρωποι; What would rid the world of injuries? If the by-standers*, says he, *would have the same resentment with those that suffer the wrong; Εἰ ὁμοίως ἄχθοιντο τοῖς ἀδικουμένοις οἱ μὴ ἀδικούμενοι.*[m] If the reader will but follow that great man's advice, and have an equal sense of my ill usage as if it had fallen upon himself; I dare then challenge him to think, if he can, that I have used too much severity.

I do not love the unmanly work of making long complaints of injuries; which, I think, is the next fault to deserving them. Much less will I imitate Mr. B., who has raked together those few words of my *Dissertation* that had the least air of resentment, and repeated them six times over. For, if I was to enter into the particulars of his abuses, I must transcribe his whole Book, which, from beginning to end, is nothing else but a rhapsody of errors and calumnies.

But there's one rudeness, that I ought not to omit; because it falls upon others as much as myself. *I am satisfied*, says he, *how unnatural a step it is for an Amanuensis to start up Professor of Divinity* (p. 223). I am persuaded, every ingenuous reader must be offended at his insolence, who could suffer such stuff as this to come out of his mouth; which is a double affront, both to the whole order of Bishops, and to a whole University. As if a person, who in his youth had been an Amanuensis to a Bishop, was upon that account made unfit to be Doctor of Divinity; as if a whole University, which was pleased to confer that degree upon him, were neither fit judges of his merit, nor knew their own duty.

I should never account it any disgrace to have served the

[m] Laërt. in Solone.

Right Reverend the Bishop of Worcester* in any capacity of a scholar. But I was never Amanuensis to his Lordship nor to any body else; neither did his Lordship ever make use of any Amanuensis: so little regard has this Examiner either to decency or truth. I was first Tutor to his Lordship's son, and afterwards Chaplain to himself; and I shall always esteem it both my honour and my happiness to have spent fourteen years of my life in his family and acquaintance, whom even envy itself will allow to be the glory of our church and nation; who, by his vast and comprehensive genius, is as great in all parts of learning as the greatest next himself are in any. And I have the satisfaction to believe, that this excellent person has not the worse opinion either of my probity or my learning, for all the calumnies that the Examiner has cast upon me.

As for the general character that Mr. B. endeavours to fix upon me, that I have no learning, no judgment, no reasoning, no knowledge in books, except Indexes and Vocabularies, with many other expressions of the utmost contempt, that make up the greatest part of his Book; I do not think myself concerned to answer them. These things shall never make a dispute between us; he shall be as great as he thinks himself, and I as little as he thinks me. But then it will lie upon him to dispute with some other persons, who have been pleased to declare publicly such an esteem of me and my writings, as does not altogether agree with Mr. B.'s.

He must commence a critical war against his Excellency Mr. Ezekiel Spanhemius, who has this passage concerning me: *Sed de hoc Philostrati loco meliora fortè nos docebit, qui novâ versione et luculento commentario eundem auctorem explanandum et illustrandum suscepit, novum idemque jam lucidum litteratæ Britanniæ sidus, Richardus Bentleius.*[n] And in another place: *Talia autem ..... in Hesychium ὅσα κόνις irrepsisse, et quibus fœdè inquinatæ sint etiamnum ejus glossæ, et pridem ad eum vidimus ac passim animadvertimus; et novis-*

[* Dr. Edward Stillingfleet.—D.]

[n] Spanheim in Julian. p. 19.

simè etiam in eruditissimâ ad Jo. Millium Epistolâ post Jo. Malalam editâ, luculenter adductis pluribus eam in rem exemplis adseruit, oriens novum litteratæ Britanniæ sidus, Richardus Bentleius.[o] And again in another place: *An verò nihil uspiam de illâ fabellâ, quanquam ab aliis passim memoretur, à Sophocle sit prolatum, quod statuit in Epistolâ Malalæ additâ vir eruditissimus, et à quo magnum præclaris doctrinarum studiis incrementum licet augurari.* [&c.][p] These perhaps are no vulgar commendations, which this great man has bestowed on me; and I'll assure Mr. B. that I did not procure them by any private services; for I have not yet done myself the honour once to write to Mr. Spanhemius. So that all that he has said of me came voluntarily and freely from him; and we shall see by the event, if the present disputes about *Phalaris* will make him repent of it.

He must turn his formidable pen against Mr. Grævius, who, besides the Dedication already cited, has another passage: *Videbis hác, Lector, studiose Musicarum cupediarum, et aliud, quod tuo palato, simul ac gustáris, sat scio, arridebit mirificè. Richardus Bentleius, potentissimo Regi Gulielmo à bibliothecâ, novum, sed splendidissimum Britanniæ lumen, certior à me factus de hác Callimachi Editione, perferri ad nos jussit eruditissimas Animadversiones in quædam Hymnorum loca et in Epigrammata, quibus adjecit nova non pauca, quæ lucem antea nunquam adspexerant; . . . . . alia, quæ quidem ante legebantur, sed à nemine fuerant intellecta, clarâ luce perfudit.*[q] Mr. B. perhaps will object, that the friendship, which I have with this most learned Professor, makes him so kind in his character of me: but the candid part of mankind will rather believe the reverse of it, that my character was the reason that he honoured me with his friendship.

Mr. B. I suppose, has no great deference to the judg-

[o] Idem in Callimach. p. 455.

[p] Ibid. p. 605.

[q] Grævii Præf. ad Callim.

ments of Mr. Spanheim and Mr. Grævius; for a man that has such a false opinion of himself can hardly be supposed to have a true one of others. But I must take the freedom to tell him, that I had rather have these short expressions of the esteem of those great men, than the most studied panegyrics of him and all his party. Neither would I consent that these passages should be blotted out, to have all his abuses of me blotted out with them, both those he has made already, and those he shall make hereafter. For as a commendation from the greatest men is the greatest of commendations; so a disparagement from men of no knowledge in the things they pretend to judge of, is the least of disparagements.

After the testimonies of these two great men, I will not produce any more; lest I should seem to trust to the number rather than the quality of those that speak well of me. I am entirely of his opinion, who was *contentus paucis, sed magnis laudatoribus*. And I will once more borrow the form of argument, that Æmilius Scaurus used against Varius Sucronensis:[r] *Mr. Spanheim and Mr. Grævius give a high character of Dr. B.'s learning; Mr. Boyle gives the meanest that malice can furnish him with: Utri creditis, Quirites? Whether of the characters will the present age or posterity believe?*

The Examiner has given two descriptions, one of a *Pedant*, and another of a *good Critic;* designing to draw the first as my picture, and the latter as his own. But perhaps, if we compare the pictures with the originals, he may be forced by his readers to change one of the places here with me, as he voluntarily did with the Sophist in the case of *Leucon* and his *Ass*.[s]

1. His *first and surest mark of a Pedant is, to write without observing the rules of civility or common decency, and without distinguishing the characters of those he writes against* (p. 93). Upon this article, he accuses two expres-

[r] See here, p. xii. [s] See here, p. xlvii.

sions of mine (p. 94); and yet both of them are both civilly worded and truly said. Then he mentions some *coarse compliments* upon himself, which I have already accounted for: only here he says, I compare him with *Lucian's Ass;* which, were it true, would be no *coarse compliment,* but a very *obliging* one. For *Lucian's Ass* was a very intelligent and ingenious Ass, and had more sense than any of his Riders: he was no other than Lucian himself in the shape of an Ass, and had a better talent at kicking and bantering than ever the Examiner will have, though it seems to be his chief one. Let the reader too observe by the way, that Mr. B. in this place has it, *Lucian's Ass;* but in another he cites it truly, *Leucon's Ass:* and yet we are told, the very same hand writ both the passages.

But to bring the Examiner near to the picture, if perhaps it may have some little resemblance to himself. Has he observed the rules of *civility,* in writing the most scurrilous and virulent Book, that the age has yet seen? has he kept to the measures of *decency,* in raking up so many tales and hearsays, that a man of honour would scorn to repeat? has he distinguished the *character of him he wrote against,* in abusing and vilifying upon the falsest surmises a man in Holy Orders, a Doctor in Divinity, a domestic servant to one of the greatest of Kings, and the first that was employed to preach the Lecture established by the great Mr. Boyle, a relation of the Examiner's? If these be against all rules of *civility,* and *decency,* and *distinction of characters;* then, I suppose, his first and surest mark of a Pedant will be thought to hit himself.

2. *A second mark is, to use a Greek or Latin word, when there's an English one, that signifies the very same thing* (p. 93). Now, if this be one of his marks, himself is a Pedant, by his own confession; for, in this very sentence of his, *signify* is a Latin word, and there's an English one that *means* the very same thing. We shall do the Examiner therefore no injury in calling him *Pedant,* upon this article. But, if such a general censure, as this forward Author here

passes, had been always fastened upon those that enrich our language from the Latin and Greek stores; what a fine condition had our language been in! 'Tis well known, it has scarce any words, besides monosyllables, of its native growth; and were all the rest imported and introduced by *Pedants?*. At this rate, the ignominy of Pedantry will fall upon all the best writers of our nation; and upon none more heavily than the Examiner's great relation, the incomparable Robert Boyle, whose whole style is full of such Latin words. But, when the Examiner is possessed with a fit of rage against me, he lays about him without consideration or distinction, never minding whom he hits, whether his own relation, or even himself. The words in my Book, which he excepts against, are *commentitious, repudiate, concede, aliene, vernacular, timid, negoce, putid,* and *idiom;* every one of which were in print, before I used them; and most of them, before I was born. And are they not all regularly formed, and kept to the true and genuine sense that they have in the original? Why may we not say *negoce* from *negotium,* as well as *commerce* from *commercium,* and *palace* from *palatium?* Has not the French nation been before-hand with us in espousing it? and have not we *negotiate* and *negotiation,* words that grow upon the same root, in the commonest use? And why may not I say *aliene,* as well as the learned Sir Henry Spelman; who used it LXXX. year since, and yet was never thought a Pedant? But he says, *My words will be hissed off the stage, as soon as they come on* (p. 287). If so, they would have been hissed off, long before I had come on. But the Examiner might have remembered, before he had talked thus at large, who it was that distinguished his style with *ignore* and *recognosce,* and other words of that sort, which nobody has yet thought fit to follow him in. For his argument, if it proved any thing, would prove perhaps too much; and bring the Glory of his own Family into the tribe of Pedants. Though I must freely declare, I would rather use, not my own words only, but even these too; (if I did it sparingly,

and but once or twice at most in CLII. pages;) than that single word of the Examiner's, *cotemporary* (p. 166, 167); which is a downright Barbarism. For the Latins never use *co* for *con*, except before a vowel, as *coequal, coeternal;* but, before a consonant, they either retain the N, as *contemporary, constitution;* or melt it into another letter, as *collection, comprehension.* So that the Examiner's *cotemporary** is a word of his own *coposition*, for which the Learned World will *cogratulate* him.

3. *Another token of a Pedant is, the use of Greek and Latin Proverbs* (p. 94). But, however, I'll run the risk of it once more, and make bold to use one Proverbial Saying:

> *Homine imperito nunquam quicquam injustius;*
> *Qui, nisi quod ipse fecit, nihil rectum putat.*†

[* Against this it has been alleged, that we have the words *Co-founder, Co-mate,* and *Co-partner;* and the Mathematicians have *Co-secant, Co-sine,* and *Co-tangent;* and the Lawyers have *Co-parceny.* But as every one of these words is formed contrary to all rule, so no one of them has any thing to plead for it: two of the first three having, indeed, no meaning at all, but what was already fully conveyed in *Mate* and *Partner;* the second three being merely technical and elementary, nor ever in ordinary or common use; and the last only to be found in authors, who do not pique themselves upon elegancy of style, or correctness of expression. And the constant form of all these compounds, agreeably to Dr. B.'s rule, compact, compare, compartment, compeer, compile, complain, complete, comply, compose, comprehend, comprise, compunction; contact, contagion, contaminate, contain, contemn, contend, contiguous, contingent, contorted, contusion; cöaction, cöeval, cöetaneous, cöequal, cöercion, cöeternal, cöincident, cöition, cöoperate, cöordinate; which are all regular, and in common use, prove what is the genuine and only just rule of formation to all of this class. Yet so perverse and obstinate are many, that *co-temporary* is now, after four-score years, as much used as ever; but chiefly, I believe, by those, who either never heard of this correction, or were early taught to despise it, and disdain the author. Dr. Johnson has put both Contemporary and Cotemporary into his Dictionary; which is very right, as they are both in use: but he might have given better authority than Locke, for the latter. For, I believe, Stillingfleet always wrote Cotemporary, in his earlier works, probably in compliance with custom: as Lord Lyttleton had done, in his History of Henry II., and declared, he knew not but it was universal; but was afterwards convinced, and had every leaf cancelled in which it occurred.—SALTER. *Ad. note on ed.* 1777.]

[† Ter. *Adelph.* I. ii. 18.—D.]

Why forsooth is it more pedantry in me, to use Latin Proverbs in English discourse, than in Cicero, to use Greek ones in Latin? Nay, do not even Greek Proverbs make as good a figure now in English, as then they did in Latin? If Mr. B. can spare any time from his Phalaris's Epistles to look into Cicero's, he'll find him in every page among the herd of Pedants. If I had used Proverbs in my *Sermons against Atheism*, or upon any solemn argument or occasion; the Examiner's censure had been more just. But to blame the use of them in an Epistle or a Dissertation, which have been always allowed to be their proper places, is itself a very ill mixture of ignorance and pedantry; for, if they cannot be used there without pedantry, they must be banished out of all sorts of writings. So that Aristotle, Theophrastus, Chrysippus, Aristarchus, and some others of the best Wits of old, and among the moderns the great Erasmus and the great Scaliger, made collections of Proverbs, merely to serve *Pedants*. Erasmus's own writings are full of them; and he will be thought to have had as much wit, and as little of pedantry, as Mr. B. and his Directors. And the great treasuries, from whence he collected them, are the writings of Plato, Plutarch, and Lucian; who *among some little men may go for* Pedants, *but among the wise and sensible part of mankind* will pass for men of wit (p. 99).

4. *To over-rate the price of knowledge, is another sign of Pedantry* (p. 94). And let the world judge between the Examiner and me, whether of us is most concerned in this character of a Pedant. I have never published any thing yet, but at the desire of others. My Sermons in Mr. Boyle's Lecture were required for the press by the Honourable the Trustees; my Epistle about Jo. Antiochensis was desired by the Right Reverend the Bishop of Lichfield;* my Notes on Callimachus by Mr. Grævius; and my Dissertation upon Phalaris by Mr. Wotton. The only book that I have

[* Dr. William Lloyd, translated to Worcester in 1699.—*Note on ed.* 1777.]

writ upon my own account is this present Answer to Mr. B.'s objections: and I assure him, I set no great *price* upon't; the errors that it refutes are so many, so gross and palpable, that I shall never be very proud of the victory.

But then a man that *over-rates the price of* his performances acts the very reverse of this. He engages in matters where he has no concern; he obtrudes his notions upon the world, though neither his friends desire him, nor the business oblige him to meddle. And is not this the picture of the Examiner? He has writ a large Book in behalf of *Phalaris's Epistles*, which has hitherto been the public diversion, and will be so too hereafter, but in a different way; and yet he professes, that *he was not* IN THE LEAST *concerned to vindicate them* (p. 202).

5. *But an assuming and positive way of delivering one's self, upon points especially that are not capable of being perfectly cleared, is Pedantry* (p. 94). Now, to take no notice of the rest of his Book, which is nothing but heaps of errors delivered in the most arrogant and insulting language, I'm content to be tried by this very paragraph of his, which of us two seem to have sat for this picture. He has cited here xv. passages out of my whole Dissertation, which he pretends are delivered in an *assuming and positive* way, and yet, he says, are *certainly false*. Whereas every one of them are true, and may be *perfectly cleared*, except one small mistake about *προδεδωκότα*, and that too is delivered without any *assuming* expression. But let us see Mr. B.'s behaviour. *Where the contrary*, says he, *is* MOST CERTAINLY *true; as it is, and shall be proved to be, in* ALL *those instances here referred to* (p. 95). Now, if this be not an *assuming and positive way*, what is? And yet, in xiv. of his xv. instances, he is miserably mistaken.

6. *To depart from the common ways of writing, on purpose to shew exactness, is a piece of affectation, that savours of Pedantry* (p. 95). Upon which article he accuses my spelling *Taurominium*: for he says, *it's* GENERALLY *writ Tauromenium, both by Ancients and Moderns*. Now, if the con-

trary of this be *certainly true*, who will then be the Pedant? The learned Cluverius, who made it his business to search all the Books and MSS. that relate to Sicily, says, *It's sometimes spelt Tauromenium, and sometimes Tauromenia, but* GENERALLY *Taurominium*.[t] And Mr. B. must write at another rate than yet he has done, before the world will prefer his testimony before that of Cluverius.

Mr. B. here *goes a little out of his way to do right to . . . .** *against Mr. Wotton*, who had taken notice of an absurd usage of *Delphos* for *Delphi* (p. 96). And because it lies a little *in my way*, I will do right to Mr. Wotton: for indeed the case is my own; because I too have called it *Delphi*, and rejected the common error. Mr. B. defends his *Delphos* upon this only pretence, that it has been the *common custom* of our English writers, five of whom he names there, to call it so. An admirable reason, and worthy to be his own! As if the most palpable error, that shall happen to obtain and meet with reception, must therefore never be mended! One would think he had borrowed it from the Popish Priest who for xxx. years together had read *Mumpsimus* in his Breviary instead of *Sumpsimus*; and, when a learned man told him of his blunder, *I'll not change*, says he, *my old Mumpsimus for your new Sumpsimus*. 'Tis a known story, but I'll give it him in the words of Sir Richard Pace, who was *a man of business and an ambassador too*, and upon those accounts will have more authority with the Examiner.[u] If Mr. B. then will not change his old *Delphos* for our new *Delphi*, he shall have leave to keep his *Mumpsi-*

[t] Cluver. Sicil. p. 90. Plerumque Taurominium.

[* *i. e.* Sir William Temple: "And he, of all men, ought not to have "arraigned the Modern Ignorance in Grammar, who puts *Delphos* for *Delphi* "every where in his *Essays*, though he knows that proper names borrowed from "Latin and Greek are always put in the nominative case in our language." *Wotton's Refl. upon Ancient and Modern Learning*, p. 59, sec. ed.—D.]

[u] *Paceus:* De Fructu, qui ex Doctrinâ percipitur. *Basil.* 1517, p. 80. Quidam indoctus Sacrificus Anglus per annos triginta *Mumpsimus* legere solitus est loco *Sumpsimus;* et quum moneretur à docto, ut errorem emendaret, respondit, Se nolle mutare suum antiquum *Mumpsimus* ipsius novo *Sumpsimus*.

mus as long as he pleases. But when he would put it upon us for *good English*, for that we must beg his pardon. The word is not yet so naturalised in England, but it may, and certainly will, be sent back again to *Barbary*, its native country. We have instances of other words, that had both longer continuance and more general reception than he can plead for his *Delphos*, and yet they were *hissed off the stage* at last. In the old Editions of the English Bibles in Henry the VIII.'s time, it was printed *Asson* and *Mileton*;[v] afterwards, under Queen Elizabeth, it was changed into *Asson* and *Miletum*; but in the last review under King James the First, it was rectified *Assos* and *Miletus*. Here's a case that's exactly parallel with this of our Examiner: *Miletum* and *Asson* were at first supposed to be nominative cases; just as *Delphos* was mistaken to be, like *Argos*, *Samos*, and *Delos*. But, we see, upon better information, the words were discarded. Neither the stamp of Royal authority, nor the universal use in every parish, nay almost every family, of England, for two or three generations, could protect them from being exploded. A most certain argument, that the whole kingdom then believed, that analogy and reason ought to have a greater force than vulgar error, though established by the longest and commonest custom. In the old Translation of Virgil set out by Phaer and Dr. Twyne,* they are called the XII. Books of *Virgil's Æneidos*; and the running title of every page is the I. or II. or III. Book of *Virgil's Æneidos*. Without question, that was the language in those days all over the nation. So that, if the Examiner's *Mumpsimus* should pass for an argument, the *Æneidos* should be the current language at this day; and those that call it *Æneis* must be run down for Pedants. I dare venture to foretell the Examiner, that his *Delphos* in a few years will be thought as barbarous as *Æneidos*: and, if his Book shall happen to be preserved any where, as an useful common-place-book for ridicule,

[v] Act. Apost. xx. 14, 15.

[* Old ed. "Thyne."—D.]

banter, and all the topics of calumny; this very page about *Delphos* may perhaps, before he grows an old man, be made an unwelcome evidence against himself. I see here that the excellent Bishop of Lichfield* (who, as appears by his most admirable Dictionary to the great Bishop Wilkins's *Real Character*, has the largest and nicest knowledge of the English language of any man living) calls it *Delphi* in his printed, though unpublished, *Chronology*, which I had the honour to see; and so did the learned gentleman Mr. Stanley long ago, in his *Lives of the Philosophers*. I do not here disparage those excellent pens that have unawares fallen into the common error; but to defend it against manifest reason, and to vilify those that would reform it, is a plain instance of a positive and pedantic genius.

I must take hold of this occasion to do another *piece of right* to Mr. Wotton. For the Examiner says, It's hoped Mr. W. will publicly declare, that he neither assisted nor approved my *Dissertation*. But I myself can save him half that labour; and therefore here I do aver, that neither Mr. Wotton nor any one else assisted me, either in that work, or in this: so that I alone am accountable for the errors in them both.

Though, after such an instance of Mr. B.'s judgment in language and style, I might safely despise his pert censures upon mine; yet I will crave the reader's patience, while I answer those exceptions of his that at present I can remember. In two or three places of his Book, he would ridicule my expression FIRST INVENTOR, as if it were mere nonsense. If it be so, it's a very new sort of it, and perhaps may come off better than somebody's sense; for it has both good reason and great authorities in its behalf. The word FIRST there is no idle and superfluous epithet, nor borders upon tautology; for there may truly be a first, and a second, and more inventors of the very same thing. The Chinese in-

[* Dr. William Lloyd.—D.]

vented the use of Guns and Printing;* and so did the Europeans, without knowing at that time that they were used in the East: and may we not ask the question, *Whether* INVENTED *them* FIRST, without danger of nonsense? Terence[w] therefore is not only in danger, but manifestly caught in't, when he says,

> *Hoc novum est aucupium: ego adeo hanc* PRIMUS INVENI *viam:*

and so is Lucretius,[x] when he speaks of his master,

> *Qui* PRINCEPS *vitæ rationem* INVENIT *eam, quæ*
> *Nunc appellatur Sapientia.*—

After these two, we have no need to name more of the Latins: let us see, if some of the best Wits of Greece are not guilty of the same nonsense. And among these I find Pindar as deep in't as any body; *Τόν ῥα Τέρπανδρός ποθ' ὁ Λέσβιος ΕΥΡΕ ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ἐν δείπνοισι Λύδιον ψαλμόν;*[y] and Herodotus and Plato in the very same condition; where the former says, *ΠΡΩΤΟΥΣ Αἰγυπτίους ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπων ΕΞΕΥΡΕΕΙΝ τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν;*[z] and the latter, *Τοῦτον δὲ (τὸν Θεοῦθ) ΠΡΩΤΟΝ ἀριθμόν τε καὶ λογισμὸν ΕΥΡΕΙΝ.*[a] Or, if printed books will not satisfy the Examiner, I will give him it in an Inscription, *"Ταγνις ὁ Φρὺξ αὐλοὺς ΠΡΩΤΟΣ*

[* Dr. Bentley has adopted the opinion of those who have confounded the European mode of PRINTING with the ENGRAVED TABLETS used in China, and invented about the year 930. See "Origin of Printing," 1774, 8vo. p. 23. The first Printing in Europe was from WOODEN BLOCKS, at Harlem, in 1430, by Laurentius, who soon proceeded to SEPARATE WOODEN TYPES, p. 64; in 1464, Geinsfleich by the aid of Fust contrived, at Mentz, CUT METAL TYPES, p. 85. The art was finally completed, by the invention of MATRICES, by Schœffer, in 1452, p. 91.—The earliest account of the use of gunpowder in Europe is in 1338, at the siege of Puy Guillaume. Du Cange, in voce BOMBARDA. Its force was known by our countryman Roger Bacon, as appears in his Opus Majus, to Pope Clement IV. 1267, p. 474, and Præf. p. xi. Cannon were used by the Venetians against the Genoese, 1378. Pancirolus De Inventoribus.—*Note on ed.* 1777.]

[w] Ter. Eun. II. ii.

[x] Lucret. v. 9.

[y] Athen. 635. [= v. 304. *ed. Schw.*, who gives Λυδῶν for Λύδιον.—D.]

[z] Herod. ii. p. 91.

[a] Plato in Phædro.

HTPEN.[b] And is not Mr. B. now a judicious Censurer, to come with his little cavils against an expression, which the best writers in the world have so frequently used? For, besides the passages here produced, I dare undertake to bring fifty more: and among the best of our own nation, it's one of the commonest phrases; particularly it's adopted by our English Cicero, the Right Reverend the Bishop of Rochester,* in his *History of the Royal Society;* where philosophy and eloquence have renewed as strict an acquaintance as they had in Cicero's *Philosophica* seventeen hundred years ago.

Another *happy phrase,* which, he says, *I have newly minted,* is *the* MIEN *of a* FACE; which, as he takes it, is much the same thing with *the behaviour of a look,* or *the carriage of a smile* (p. 73). His expression indeed is a little obscure; and his readers, I find, are not agreed about his meaning. But the thing he aims at seems to be this, that *mien* signifies the behaviour and the carriage of the whole person, and cannot be applied to a single part, the face. An observation that shews him to be as great a critic in the modern languages, as he is in the ancient. For *mien* does not signify *behaviour,* even when it's spoken of the whole person, but the air and look that results from it. The word *mien* is of French original, and both the English and the Italians borrowed it of that nation. So that the sense of it must be determined from the usage of the French. And if those be consulted, they will tell us, that though *mine* be often extended to denote the air of the whole man, yet it chiefly and originally means the *air of the face.* So Monsieur Pomey in his Dictionary, MINE DU VISAGE, (which is exactly *mien of the face*) *oris species, oris habitus, nativa vultûs compositio.* And so the late Dictionary by the Academy; MINE, *l'air qui résulte de la conformation extérieure de la personne, et principalement du visage.* One would have guessed by the Examiner's talking out of Balzac and Bruyère,

[b] Marm. Arund. l. 19.

[* Dr. Thomas Sprat.—*Note on ed.* 1777.]

(p. 98, 99), that he had been too well acquainted with the writings of the French; and yet we see, by this instance, he was as raw in that language as he is in the Greek. But perhaps since his late Journey to Paris, he may have brought back with him *une mine du visage*, though he did not carry over with him *a mien of a face*.

7. Another mark, he says, of a *Pedant is an itch of contradicting great men upon very slight grounds* (p. 97). I must own, that I am sometimes forced in my writings to *contradict great men*, by correcting such oversights as they made through inadvertency or want of information. But then I do it without any diminution to their character; and if that modesty be observed, the contradicting them in this way deserves the highest commendation, and is such a sort of pedantry as the Examiner and his Director will never be accused of. But the instance he charges me with, is *my brisk censure of Grotius and Scaliger, for not knowing the measure of an Anapæstic verse* (p. 98): and whether I did that upon *very slight grounds*, this very Answer[c] will shew. But let us see the Examiner's words here, if perhaps this last character of a Pedant may not prove to be his own picture. *When 'tis* PLAIN, says he, *as I shall* SHEW BEFORE I LAY DOWN MY PEN, *that the Doctor would never have censured 'em, if he had known it himself* (p. 98). What a formidable threat, and what a miserable performance! The stuff that he has brought there is so shameful and scandalous, so inexcusable in a very school-boy, betrays such ignorance of the commonest rules of *Prosodia* and *Syntax;* that, if he has but learning enough to know when he's confuted (which is not every body's case), he may have the wisdom to take his leave of the press, as long as he lives, for that part of learning.

But, if an itch of *contradicting* great men upon *very slight* grounds has a relish of pedantry; to abuse and revile great men, and that without any ground at all, must be the very

[c] See here, p. 132. [= the latter portion of the section on Thericlean cups.—D.]

spirit and quintessence of it. And we know a late writer, that in the very entrance of his Work calls Dion Chrysostom *as errant a sophist and declaimer as ever was*, and his discourse *tedious and insipid* (p. 26); that says, *Manilius has no wit* in him, and is as unlike to Ovid as Thersites was to Nireus (p. 28); that says, *Laërtius is a writer of Dr. B.'s own form* (p. 238), which, as he has been pleased to use me, is the vilest of characters; that calls *Athenæus rude and insolent*, and *a confident clown* (p. 238, 9), when the sole occasion of it is his own ignorance. I shall give here a short account of his affront upon Athenæus, to shew what a strange compound must go to the making up a Defender of Phalaris.

The Examiner accuses Athenæus,[d] for calling Plato *dog* and *liar*. Now the words of Athenæus are, *that Antisthenes says the same thing of Socrates, that Plato says; but yet the matter is not true:* χαρίζεται γὰρ καὶ ὁ κύων οὗτος πολλὰ τῷ Σωκράτει, *for this Cynic too compliments Socrates in many particulars.* Antisthenes was Diogenes's master, and the founder of the sect of the *Cynics:* so that κύων here means a *Cynic*, and not a *dog;* and is so far from being a reproachful word, that it was adopted by the whole sect as a name of honour. But the learned and sagacious Mr. B. takes κύων for a very *dog*, and draws in Plato to have a share in the name, as well as Antisthenes; which Athenæus never dreamt of. And is not this now a just occasion of calling so excellent a writer an *insolent* and *confident clown?* But we have instances of late, that such qualifications as those are not the properties of *clowns* alone.

But Mr. B. is not contented with abusing the Ancients; unless he bestow his civilities upon some of the greatest of the Moderns. *Salmasius*, he says, *and Scaliger were all* GALL *and* PRIDE *and* PEDANTRY; *which made the vast learning they were masters of sit so ill upon them, that the world hated and despised them, at the same time that it was pro-*

[d] Athen. p. 216. [= ii. 331. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

fiting by them (p. 225). If he pleases, he may add, that they are *hated* and *despised* by some who will never be able to *profit by them*. But are these the *expressions that become a young Writer* (Pref. p. 3)? though in truth they could come from no body but a *young* and unfledged *Writer*, that neither knows the works of those great men, nor the history of that age. Did the *World hate and despise them*, who were admired and courted by the greatest Princes; who were invited out of their own country with the solemnity almost of an Embassy, that they would honour a potent Republic with their presence, and accept of a noble pension without any incumbrance of an office; who, as appears by the Letters written to them from the best Wits of all the nations of Europe, were universally esteemed as the glory of their age? 'Tis true, they met with some very unworthy usage, which proceeded not from *contempt*, but a quite contrary passion. He must be a *young Writer*, and a young Reader too, that believes Milton and Petavius had themselves as mean thoughts of Salmasius, as they endeavoured to make others have. He that studies to represent one of known and eminent merit to be a mere fool and an idiot, he gives himself the lie; and betrays, he's either acted with envy, or corrupted by a faction. But the greatest persecution these great men lay under was upon the account of Religion. They were the ornament of the Reformation, and, by their influence and example, gave such a spirit of learning to it, as made it triumph over its enemies, who would then have engrossed the reputation of letters, and confined it to their own party. They were vilified therefore and traduced by those who, if they had been of their own communion, would have almost adored them. So that Protestants should be tender and cautious from what hands they receive the characters of those great men. And if a magisterial air and too much heat and passion appear in their writings, a candid reader will forgive it, and say,

Sume superbiam
Quæsitam meritis;[e]

he'll impute some of it to their temper, but the most to the ill usage they met with from envy and detraction. To *hate and despise* a man, *at the same time they are profiting by him*, is an ill mixture of the worst of human passions. A little haughtiness and warmth, when accompanied with merit, will be forgiven by some, but such black ingratitude will be *hated and despised* by all.

Mr. B. is pleased to bestow his next favour upon Ludovico Castelvetro; whom he calls *an Italian* PEDANT, *famous for his snarling faculty, and contradicting great men upon very slight grounds;* and he thinks *Balzac says very well of him, that he was a Public Enemy* (p. 98). But whether somebody else will not be *infamous for His snarling faculty*, we may predict from this very instance. This PEDANT, as our modest Author calls him, was one of the most ingenious and judicious and learned writers of his age; and his books have at this present such a mighty reputation, that they are sold for their weight in silver in most countries of Europe. I will mention but three testimonies of him: the famous Lilius Gyraldus[f] says, He had seen some of his pieces, which fully satisfied him, that he was *judicio sanè quàm acerrimo, et eruditione non vulgari.* Henricus Stephanus dedicated a book[g] to him; and, says he, I refer the censure of a piece of poetry, *Sagaciæ et emunctæ tuæ nari*, Ludovice κριτικώτατε et ποιητικώτατε. And he has this character given him by Menagius;[h] *Ludovicus Castelvetrius in Commentariis illis suis eruditissimis et acutissimis;* and again, *Omnium optime acutissimus Castelvetrius.* I am persuaded our Examiner has never read one line of this author, whom he abuses thus out of Balzac, a writer, without undervaluing him, many degrees inferior to Castelvetro. I

[e] Hor. Od. III. xxx.
[f] Gyrald. II. Dialog. p. 421.
[g] Parrhasii Epist.
[h] Menag. ad Laërt.

had the fortune some years ago to meet with most of the pieces of Castelvetro and his antagonists; and I find that the sole occasion of all his troubles in Italy was a copy of verses made by Annibal Caro in praise of the House of France; so that the very subject of it was enough to bias the judgments of Balzac and some others of that nation. These verses were dispersed over Italy and France, and received with mighty applause; and being sent to Castelvetro by a private friend at Rome, who desired his judgment of them, he returned him some short censures, desiring they should neither be published, nor shewn to any one as his. But by chance they got abroad and were printed, and brought such a violent faction against him as made the poor man weary of Italy. The very first lines of Caro's verses are,

Venite a l' ombra de' gran Gigli d' oro,
Care Muse, devote a' miei Giacinti:

where the Muses are invited to come under the shadow of Flower-de-luces. Upon which Castelvetro remarked; That the Muses must be less than pigmies, if they could be shadowed by Flower-de-luces, which were scarce shelter enough for little insects. Who can have the folly to deny, that this censure was just? *Quis tam Lucili fautor ineptus, ut neget hoc?** And yet this fault, and others as plain as this, were stoutly maintained by Caro and his party. For the advantage of Caro was, that he was Member of an *Academy*, and a whole College was engaged for him; and when neither reason nor truth was of their side, they confided in their numbers,

Defendit numerus, junctæque umbone phalanges.†

[* Hor. *Serm.* I. x. 2.

"Quis tam Lucili fautor *inepte* est,
Ut *non* hoc *fateatur?*"—D.]

[† Juvenal, II. 46.—D.]

Their way of refuting Castelvetro[1] was, by Pasquils, Lampoons, Burlesque Dialogues, Public Speeches in the Academy, Declamations of School-boys, and, in the close of all, *A short Account of Messer Lodovico Castelvetro by way of Index*, full of the most virulent abuses.[k] These were the fair and honourable methods of managing their controversy: and though their Adversary, while he lived, suffered much from their malice, yet posterity has been just to him, and has set an extraordinary value upon all his performances; while theirs upon this argument (for in other things they were men of some worth) have nothing that now makes them inquired after, but the great reputation of the man they abuse. And such a man will never be called *an Italian* PEDANT, but by those that copy after his Adversaries in their infamous way of writing.

It's now time to draw towards a conclusion of this Preface; which I shall do by informing the reader, that when these papers were put to the press, I designed to have brought into this Volume *The Dissertations about Æsop and the rest;* but this of *Phalaris* alone taking up more paper than I expected, I am obliged to put off the others to another opportunity. There are a few things therefore referred to in this part, which do not appear here; but they shall be all made out in the next. I have it already by me; and when I can have leisure to transcribe it for the press, the Examiner shall have it.

He has been pleased to say more than once, that I spent two or three years of my life in writing my First Dissertation (Pref. p. i.—p. 24); and yet he owns he never once saw my face; much less can he have any knowledge of the course of my studies. But he has a singular way of talking, as he says, *at a venture*. I drew up that Dissertation in the spare hours of a few weeks; and while the Printer was employed about one leaf, the other was amaking. 'Tis now I think about XL.

[1] Apologia degli Accademici di Banchi di Roma.

[k] Tavola della Contenenza. Ibid. [See the concluding paragraph of this Preface.—D.]

weeks since his Examination came abroad; VIII. of which I spent in the country, where I had no thoughts of Him and his Controversy. And if in the rest of that time I have published this Book, and have the Second ready for publication; I conceive the world will be satisfied, that I could not spend three years in the other Book of nine sheets only. And yet I'll assure him, but for the delays of the press, which I could not remedy, he had had this Answer some months ago. In a small part of the last of those three years, which he says were all laid out upon *Phalaris*, I wrote my Notes on *Callimachus;* and Mr. Grevius perhaps will thank Mr. B. if in six years' time he will send him the like upon any other author. But suppose his accusation true; I had rather have spent all that time in discovering truth, than have spent three days in maintaining an error.

But he says the whole thing *is a very inconsiderable point, which a wise man would grudge the throwing away a week's thought upon* (p. 24). And I doubt not but many others, whose designs and studies are remote from this kind of learning, will follow this censure. To such men as these I must answer, that, if the dispute be quite out of their way, they have liberty to let it alone; it was not designed for them, but for others, that know how to value it; who, if the principal point about *Phalaris* were quite dropt, will think the other heads, that are here occasionally handled, not unworthy of a scholar. But that the single point whether *Phalaris* be genuine or no, is of no small importance to learning, the very learned Mr. Dodwell is a sufficient evidence; who, espousing *Phalaris* for a true author, has endeavoured by that means to make a great innovation in the ancient Chronology. To undervalue this dispute about *Phalaris* because it does not suit to one's own studies, is to quarrel with a circle because it is not a square. If the question be not of vulgar use, it was writ therefore for a few; for even the greatest performances upon the most important subjects are no entertainment at all to the many of the world.

I will venture here beforehand, and to give this character of Mr. B.'s performance upon *Æsop*,* that though it is not wholly unworthy of its Author, yet it seems a little below him. The style of it is something worse than that of the Defence of *Phalaris;* and the learning of it, which he ought to take for a compliment, a great deal worse. If there be one thing which he's said right in his *Phalaris* about προδίδωμι and διώκω; I'll pass my word, there will not be one good thing in his *Æsop*, when I call it to account. His observations there about Babrius's Verses will be found worse than those here about the Anapæsts of Æschylus and Seneca; his accusing me there as a Plagiary from Nevelettus and Camerarius will appear much more unjust than what he says here about my pillaging Vizzanius and his own *poor notes;* his grimace there about Socrates will be shewn more impertinent, if possible, than his long banter here, *That Dr. B. cannot be the Author of the Dissertation.* (p. 184, &c.) Which insipid banter seems rather to have been writ in a tavern than in a study; and is not fit to be answered by me. But, if another should answer him in his own way, and pretend to prove, *that Mr. B. is not the Author of the Examination* from the variety of styles in't, from its contradictions to his edition of Phalaris, from its contradictions to itself, from its contradictions to Mr. B.'s character and to his title of Honourable, and from several other topics; it would be taken perhaps for no raillery, but too serious a repartee; or at least might pass for a true jest, though intended only for a merry one.

Mr. B. has been pleased to threaten me with the resentments of *a whole Society* (Pref. p. 6), and *a great Body of Learned Men* (p. 289). I must own, I do not well know what apprehensions to have of this threat. For as I have done no injury to any Society, so I think I have no reason to be afraid of their resentments. It does not appear to me,

[* John Freind was the director of Mr. B.'s studies, mentioned above, p. xliv., and wrote the part on Æsop: Smallridge wrote the banter spoken of in this page.—SALTER. *Ad. note on ed.* 1777.]

that Mr. B. has any commission to threaten thus in their name: and if he has not, his making use of their authority is a sort of libel upon them, which would represent *a great Body of Learned Men* as the partakers and patrons of the faults of his Book. I have a true honour and great esteem for that noble and flourishing Society, which is supposed to be meant here; and I should think I did them a great injury, to suspect they will interpose in *Phalaris's* behalf: for, when a cause cannot be defended, the numbers of those that engage in't make it only the more scandalous.

But since Mr. B. has been so free as to threaten a Reply, even before he sees what I say in my Defence; though I will not prescribe to so great a genius any method of his answer, yet I think I may make bold to tell him, what I shall look upon to be No Answer.

1. If he pretends, that he did not maintain, that his *Phalaris* is genuine; but only that my arguments do not prove him to be otherwise; I shall look upon this as a shuffle, and no Answer at all. For, if he suspects whether he's genuine, and yet allows none of my arguments; the world desires to have his reasons, why he has that suspicion of him. I observe indeed, that there's one argument against him proposed by Mr. B., which I had not taken notice of; *That the names of those, whom the Epistles are directed to, seem sometimes to be feigned on purpose, according to the subject of those Epistles.* (Præf. ad Phal.) Till Mr. B. shall think fit to give us other grounds of his suspicion, the world will take the liberty to think that this is all he has. So that we are to take the measure of his great judgment by this scale, that all my reasons go for nothing with him, and his own single and substantial one goes for all.

But perhaps he will now be more loyal than ever to his *Sicilian Prince*, and have no scruples at all about his true title to the Letters. For he *assures the reader, that his doubts about the authority of the Epistles, since he read my Dissertation, are much lessened; and if I write once more upon that subject, perhaps the point will be clear to him*

(p. 33). Agreed and contented on both sides! I have writ once more against them, and Mr. B. for that reason will more firmly believe them. I desire no greater punishment to him for all his ill usage of me, than that he would maintain them to be genuine as long as he lives.

2. Or, if he comes with more Testimonies of his Bookseller or his *Humty-Dumty** Acquaintance; I shall take those for no Answer. For a man that is once convicted of an intended perjury is no longer a lawful witness: and a man that has declared publicly, that *his memory could but serve him for one particular*, can have no benefit in law allowed him of strengthening it afterwards either with *three-threads* or *four-threads*.

3. Or if he brings any new stories and hearsays about me, that are foreign to the business, I shall look upon those as no part of an Answer. For, after I have so fully disproved his capital accusations about the King's MS. and that of Sir Edward Sherburn, I shall not think myself concerned at any calumnies that he shall start hereafter.

4. Or, if he thinks fit, or any Friend for him, to reply to me in Latin (for he threatens me with a Latin Book, in the imperious style of Festus; *Hast thou appealed to Foreign Universities? to Foreign Universities thou shalt go* (p. 230); I may look perhaps upon that as an answer, but such a one as will need no Answer from me. For, if I may guess at what's to come, by the present performance, a Latin book from any hand that has been yet concerned in the Defence of *Phalaris* will carry its own Answer in itself.

5. But, if he chooses to reply in English, and meddle once more with the matter of learning; if he do not mend his hand a little, and bring a piece with fewer faults in't than the last, I shall not take that for an Answer. For my whole life might be spent at that rate in refuting the merest trash. And he has clearly the advantage of me in this point; for he may commit more mistakes in five weeks' time,

[* See note, p. xxi.—D.]

and in five sheets of paper, than can be thoroughly confuted in fifty sheets, and in a whole year.

Besides this, I may justly expect, that, if he proceeds further upon the subject of *Phalaris*, he should freely acknowledge those faults that I have refuted in his last Work. I have done the like myself; and I here sincerely declare, that I am not conscious of one error, that he observed in my *Dissertation*, which I do not own in my Answer. I design nothing but a search after truth; and will never be guilty of that mean disingenuity, to maintain a fault that I am convinced of. I require therefore the same candour from him; and if he does not perform it, I shall not reckon it as an Answer. For if he has not either judgment enough to know when he's confuted, or sincerity enough to confess it, 'tis to no purpose at all to continue the controversy.

6. But, if he thinks to drop the main subject, or but slightly to touch upon't; and to give, as he says, *a view of the Dr.'s picture in miniature* (p. ult. 3d edition), by way of burlesque and ridicule and banter, which his genius is so strongly bent to; I shall look upon that to be least of all an Answer; because it's no part of the dispute. For I'll never contest that point with him, but allow that he has no ill talent at farce and grimace. And if there be neither truth nor learning nor judgment in his Book, it shall be cried up for those other accomplishments as much as he pleases.

Mr. B. thought fit, in his second edition, to rake up all his affronts upon me together, under the title of *A short Account of Dr. B., by way of Index*. And, in an imperfect imitation of so great an example, I had drawn up *an Account*, not of Mr. B., but *of his Performance, by way of Synopsis*. But, when I saw such a multitude of errors concentred together, the sight was so deformed and disagreeable, *miseranda vel hosti*, that no resentment could prevail with me to return him his own compliment.

A

DISSERTATION

UPON THE

EPISTLES OF PHALARIS.

After the Honourable Mr. B. has despatched his account of the matters of fact relating to Himself and his Bookseller, where I am sorry to hear him say, *his honesty was concerned;* he proceeds to the main part of the dispute, *which only touches his learning* (p. 22). This, he says, will give him no *concern*, though it may put him to some *trouble. For he shall enter upon't with the indifference of a gamester, who plays but for a trifle, which it is much the same to him whether he wins or loses* (p. 22, 3).

Mr. B. here seems to *enter upon* his work a little untowardly and ominously; for a *gamester*, they say, who plays with *indifference* and without any *concern*, never plays his game well. Besides that, by this odd comparison of himself to a *gamester*, he seems to give warning, and he's as good as his word, that he will put the dice upon his readers as often as he can. But, what is worst of all, this comparison puts one in mind of a general rumour, which I make not my own, That there's another set of *gamesters*, who *play him* in his dispute, while themselves are out of sight, and safe behind the curtain.

His very first sentence acquaints his reader, *That Dr. B. has taken the liberty of writing without any method* (p. 1). Which is a bold stroke to begin with, and shews we must

expect nothing from him but what is masterly and great. I have first produced the *chronological* proofs, that Phalaris is spurious; then I consider the *language*, then the *matter* of the Epistles; and I conclude all with the argument taken from their *late appearance* in the world: and all these are ranked in their natural order, and distinguished from each other, without any mixture or confusion. And if this be writing without *method*, my ignorance, perhaps, was occasioned, because I have not read the new *System of Logic* set out for the use of Mr. Charles Boyle, after the mode of *In usum Delphini*. When I have the happiness to read that great advancement of logic, and to receive from it new light about *method;* I may then perhaps be induced to change the order of my Dissertation. But, in the mean time, I have let every thing stand as it did before; and I have distinguished the former Dissertation by printing it in a *greater letter;* and in a *smaller*, I have answered Mr. B.'s objections at the end of every article.

But I have good reason to suspect, that his cry here against my want of *method* is but a cast of his *gamester's* art, that he might have the shuffling of his own cards; and so begin his *Examination* upon such articles as he could raise the greatest bustle in. For he pleasantly distinguishes my arguments into two sorts, *those that affect the whole set of the Epistles, and those that touch only those particular Epistles from whence they are drawn* (p. 33). He begins therefore with the *general proofs*, which are only three, he says, from the *language*, and the *matter*, and the *late appearance* of the Epistles; and the others from *chronology* (which were then about a dozen, and now shall be near a score), supposing them true, he says, do but concern those single Epistles from whence they are taken; *so that the rest*, TO HIS COMFORT, *may be genuine still* (p. 155).

I cannot dismiss this facetious distinction without making a brief remark upon't, though I shall consider it more largely in another place. First, the Examiner bears very hard here upon *the most accomplished writer of the age* (Pref.

p. 3); for the great Memmius* had pronounced of the whole set, *That the Epistles of Phalaris have more race, more spirit, more force of wit and genius, than any others he had ever seen, either ancient or modern.* Now if he, with that *nicety of taste,* believed all the Epistles to be writ by the same hand (as indeed every body else does, the style and turn of them all being so exactly alike); Mr. B. puts an affront upon that great man's *taste,* when he pretends a score of the Epistles, which chronology refutes, might be foisted in *by the wantonness or vanity of imitators in after-times* (p. 155), and yet the rest be authentic. For if those *vain imitators* could copy so well in *after-times,* as to impose upon Sir . . . .† *who had written to Kings, and was qualified to judge how Kings should write* (p. 92); what becomes of his fine argument, from the *race* and the *spirit, such freedom of thought, such boldness of expression,* to prove that none but a Phalaris could write them? If Mr. B.'s distinction be admitted, Sir . . . . *must have very little skill in painting, that could not find out* a whole score of them to be *copies* by *vain and wanton imitators;* but took the whole set for *originals.* Mr. B. himself puts the same compliment upon him, that he makes such a hideous out-cry at in another, *That Sir . . . . neither knew the true time nor the true value of his authors.*

But the Examiner bears still harder upon another worthy author, the Honourable Mr. Boyle in his *Preface to Phalaris.* That ingenious and learned gentleman is expressly against this new distinction, *of proofs that affect the whole, and proofs that touch only particular Epistles.* For he owns, *that if Diodorus Siculus say true, that Tauromenium*

[* "The regard I had for the *most accomplished writer of the age,* whom "I never think of, without calling to mind those happy lines of Lucretius,

Quem tu, dea, tempore in omni
Omnibus ornatum voluisti excellere rebus,

"a character, which, I dare say, *Memmius* did not better deserve than *Sir William Temple.*" Boyle's Preface to *Bentley's Dissertations examined.*—D.]

[† Sir William Temple.—*Note on ed.* 1777.]

was not built and called so, till after the razing of Naxus by Dionysius the Tyrant, actum est de Phalaridis titulo, et ruit omnis malè sustentata conjecturis authoritas, *Phalaris's title to the Letters is quite cashiered; and all the authority of them, supported by weak surmises, must drop to the ground* (Præf. Phal. p. 3). But this *Tauromenium* is mentioned thrice only in the whole set of Epistles.[a] So that, if *Phalaris's* title to all the Epistles be rendered quite desperate by the disproof of three single ones, I have that Noble Author on my side against the whimsical distinction of the Examiner; who, though not three only but thirty of the Letters, and those not coming all together, but scattered through the whole set, be refuted from chronology, would still *comfort* himself with the cold hopes, *that the rest may be genuine.*

My former Dissertation began with a short Address* to my learned friend Mr. Wotton, with whose book it was

[a] Ep. 15, 31, 33.

[* The Address (preceded by the passage from Sir W. Temple's Essay, already quoted in the prefatory matter to this volume) is as follows:

"Sir,—I remember that, discoursing with you upon this passage of Sir W. T. "(which I have here set down), I happened to say, That, with all deference to "so great an authority, and under a just awe of so sharp a censure, I believed it "might be even demonstrated, that the Epistles of Phalaris are spurious, and "that we have nothing now extant of Æsop's own composing. This casual "declaration of my opinion, by the power of that long friendship that has been "between us, you improved into a promise, That I would send you my reasons "in writing, to be added to the new edition of your Book; believing it, as I "suppose, a considerable point in the controversy you are engaged in. For if "it once be made out, that those Writings your Adversary so extols are sup-"posititious, and of no very long standing; you have then his and his party's "own confession, that some of the later pens have outdone the old ones in their "kinds. And to others, that have but a mean esteem of the wit and style of "those books, it will be a double prejudice against him, in your favour, that he "could neither discover the true time nor the true value of his Authors. These, "I imagine, were your thoughts, when you engaged me to this that I am "now doing. But I must take the freedom to profess, that I write without any "view or regard to your controversy; which I do not make my own, nor pre-"sume to interpose in it. 'Tis a subject so nice and delicate, and of such a "mixed and diffused nature, that I am content to make the best use I can of

then published: but because in this second Edition it comes out alone, it was thought proper to leave out that little Procœmium. However, I will not omit to give an answer to those reflections that the Examiner has made upon't.

First, he tells me, *that Dion's authority*, whom I had cited there, *in this or any other case, is not very considerable; he's tedious and insipid; he's as errant a Sophist and Declaimer as ever was.* We may learn the truth of this gentleman's characters, from this one that he begins his Book with. Let's hear what others have said of Dion. His own age surnamed him *Chrysostom*[b] (the same title that was afterwards given to that great Father of the Church) upon account of his eloquence. Nor had posterity a worse opinion of him; if Philostratus, Themistius, Synesius, all men of admirable eloquence, are competent witnesses of it. So far was he from being counted *as errant a Sophist as ever was*, that both Christian Fathers and Philosophers, nay the very Sophists themselves, that would have been proud of his company, have declared him no *Sophist*, but a *Philosopher*. Themistius says[c] he was in the same quality with the Emperor Trajan, as Arius was with Augustus, and Thrasyllus with Tiberius, and Epictetus

" both Ancients and Moderns, without venturing with you upon the hazard of a " wrong comparison, or the envy of a true one. That *some of the oldest Books* " *are the best in their kinds*, the same person having the double glory of inven- " tion and perfection, is a thing observed even by some of the Ancients. (Dion. " Chrysost. Orat. 33. p. 397.) But then the Authors they gave this honour " to, are Homer and Archilochus, one the Father of Heroic Poem, and the other " of Epode and Trochaic. But the choice of Phalaris and Æsop, as they are " now extant, for the two great inimitable originals, is a piece of criticism of a " peculiar complexion, and must proceed from a singularity of palate and judg- " ment."—*Note on ed.* 1777.]

[b] Photius, Biblioth. Eunapius, p. 5. Themist. Orat. 12. Synesius in Calvisii Encomio et in Dione. Δίωνι τῷ χρυσῷ τὴν γλῶτταν. Τὴν γλῶτταν, ἣν χρυσῆν εἶχεν, ὥσπερ καὶ λέγεται.

[c] Themist. Orat. 12. Τὸν Ἄρειον ἐκεῖνον ὁ Σεβαστὸς, ὁ Τιβέριος τὸν Θράσυλον, Τραϊανὸς ὁ μέγας τὸν Δίωνα τὸν χρυσοῦν τὴν γλῶτταν, τὸν Ἐπίκτητον τὼ δύο Ἀντωνίνω.

with the two Antonines. He is ranked with Ammonius and Plutarch,[d] and Carneades and Favorinus, and such other great men, that were really philosophers, but because of their polite learning were called Sophists by the vulgar. But what need I say more, when his very works, that are yet extant, are for the most part upon political and philosophical subjects? The moderns too agree with the ancients in their character of Dion. It were easy to mention many; but, since our Examiner professes a peculiar deference to Casaubon's opinion, 'tis enough to say, that he calls him *the most excellent Philosopher*.[e] A man that traduces Dion for *a flat and insipid Sophist*, seems to own that he neither read Dion, nor these others that have so commended him.

Then he taxes me *for singularity of judgment. For never any man, till I arose, pretended to despise Phalaris. My opinion is contrary to the sense of all mankind, that have ever written before me* (p. 27). This is very peremptorily said. But Mr. B., by his own advice, should have had a care *of negatives, a very dangerous way of speech;* especially *when the contrary affirmative is most certainly true* (p. 95). For chronologers are all agreed that the great Erasmus lived before our days; and these are his words: *Those Epistles that somebody has left us, in the names of Brutus and of Phalaris, and of Seneca and St. Paul, what else can they be reckoned than little poor declamations?*[f] This is as great a contempt of them as ever I expressed; 'tis the very word I myself used, *Was ever any* Declamator's *case so extravagantly put?*

But, to give his reader another taste of somebody's *sin-*

[d] Philostrat. de Soph. p. 485, 489, 496. Synesius in Dione. Eunap. in Præfat. Τοὺς φιλοσοφήσαντας ἐν δόξῃ τοῦ σοφιστεύσαι.

[e] Gravitate captus orationum excellentissimi Philosophi. Casaub. Ep. ad H. Stephanum.

[f] Porrò Epistolæ, quas nobis reliquit nescio quis Bruti nomine, nomine Phalaridis, nomine Senecæ et Pauli, quid aliud censeri possunt quàm DECLAMATIUNCULÆ? Erasm. Ep. lib. i. epist. 1. See also his Epistle before the ivth Tome of St. Hieron.

gularity, Mr. B. tells a story of a *certain Critic of our times, who maintained* (when and where 'tis no matter), *that Ovid and Manilius were the only two Poets that had* WIT *among the Ancients*. To speak freely, I am ashamed to see a person, that writes himself *Honourable*, tell such little stories and hearsays, so below his name and character. I am not at all concerned to justify this *criticism*, for I know not that ever I said so. But, however, not to desert Manilius, for whom I have an esteem; I see no reason at all, why he that said this should be ashamed of it. For, with submission, why must Ovid and Manilius be set as wide asunder as Nireus and Thersites? (p. 28.) Better judges than Mr. B. have thought there was a likeness in the geniuses of those two poets. When our Examiner reads Manilius (for, by his censure, one would guess he yet had not), he will find in the best editions what Scaliger says of him: *A most ingenious Poet, a most elegant writer, that could manage an obscure and knotty subject with that clearness and smoothness of style; equal to Ovid in sweetness, and superior in majesty. Especially his introductions and digressions are secure above all detraction. Nothing can be more divine, more copious, more grave, more pleasant.*[g] Thus, we see, one of the greatest scholars of all the moderns, and a very great poet himself, has thought Manilius a very witty one; and, just as that *certain Critic* did, has joined him with Ovid. 'Tis an honour therefore to Dr. Bentley, that, in a comparison of writers, he is ranked here with Manilius. But what satisfaction will Mr. B. make to his admired Sir . . . . . .* for listing him with Ovid (p. 28); that Ovid, whom he modestly calls in another place, *the trifling*

[g] Poeta ingeniosissimus, nitidissimus scriptor, qui obscuras res tam luculento sermone, materiam morosissimam tam jucundo charactere exornare potuerit, Ovidio suavitate par, majestate superior. Imprimis omnia ejus procemia et παρεκβάσεις extra omnem aleam posita sunt. Nihil illis divinius, copiosius, gravius, et jucundius dici potest. Audiamus itaque olorem canentem. Scalig. in Præf.

[* Sir William Temple.—D.]

Author of the Verses upon Ibis? (p. 133.) I cannot pretend to tell, who is most obliged to him, the Roman Ovid, or the English Memmius.

To pass a censure upon all kinds of writings, to shew their several excellencies and defects, and especially to assign each of them to their proper authors, was the chief province and the greatest commendation of the ancient critics.* And it appears from those remains of antiquity that are left us, that they never wanted employment. For to forge and counterfeit books, and father them upon great names, has been a practice almost as old as letters. But it was then most of all in fashion,[h] when the Kings of Pergamus and Alexandria, rivalling one another in the magnificence and copiousness of their Libraries, gave great rates for any treatises that carried the names of celebrated authors. Which was an invitation to the scribes and copiers of those times, to enhance the price of their wares, by ascribing them to men of fame and reputation; and to suppress the true names, that would have yielded less money. And now and then even an author that wrote for bread, and made a traffic of his labours, would purposely conceal himself, and personate some old writer of eminent note; giving the title and credit of his works to the dead, that himself might the better live by them. But what was then done chiefly for lucre, was afterwards done out of glory and affectation, as an exercise of

[* See Dawes's allusion to this passage in the Preface to his *Miscel. Crit.* p. xiv. *ed. Kidd.* 1827.—D.]

[h] Galen. in Hippoc. de Naturâ Hominis, Com. II. p. 17. ed. Basil.

style, and an ostentation of wit. In this the tribe of the Sophists are principally concerned; in whose Schools it was the ordinary task to compose Ἠθοποιΐας, to make speeches and write letters in the name and character of some Hero, or great Commander or Philosopher; Τίνας ἂν εἴποι λόγους, *What would Achilles, Medea, or Alexander, say in such or such circumstances?* Thus Ovid, we see, who was bred up in that way, writ love-letters in the names of Penelope and the rest. 'Tis true, they came abroad under his own name; because they were written in Latin and in verse, and so had no colour or pretence to be the originals of the Grecian Ladies. But some of the Greek Sophists had the success and satisfaction to see their essays in that kind pass with some readers for the genuine works of those they endeavoured to express. This, no doubt, was great content and joy to them; being as full a testimony of their skill in imitation, as the birds gave to the painter when they pecked at his grapes. One of them[1] indeed has dealt ingenuously, and confessed that he feigned the Answers to Brutus, only as a trial of skill: but most of them took the other way, and, concealing their own names, put off their copies for originals; preferring that silent pride and fraudulent pleasure, though it was to die with them, before an honest commendation from posterity for being good imitators. And, to speak freely, the greatest part of mankind are so easily imposed on in this way, that there is too great an invitation to put the trick upon them. What clumsy cheats, those Sibylline Oracles

[1] Μιθριδάτης, Præf. Ep. Bruti.

now extant, and Aristeas's story of the Septuagint passed without control even among very learned men! And even some modern attempts of this kind have met with success not altogether discouraging. For, though Annius of Viterbo,* after a reputation of some years, and Inghiramius† immediately, were shamed out of all credit; yet Sigonius's Essay *De Consolatione,* as coming from a skilful hand, may perhaps pass for Cicero's with some, as long as Cicero himself shall last. Which I cannot presage of that bungling supplement to Petronius, (I mean not that from Traw,‡ but the pretended one from Belgrade,§) that scandal to all forgeries: though, I hear, 'tis at present admired as a genuine piece by some that think themselves no ordinary judges.

I had said out of Galen, *That in the age of the Ptolemies the trade of coining false authors was in greatest practice and perfection.* Wherein I am charged with several faults; as first, for citing passages *out of the way.* An accusation I should wish to be true, rather than false. For I take it to be a commendation, to entertain the reader with something that's *out of the common way;* and I'll never desire to trouble the world with *common authorities* (p. 29), as this gentleman would have me do.

But there are other old writers that tell this story (p. 29). I wish he had pleased to name them: I must freely own,

[* *Antiquitatum variarum volumina* xvii. *cum commentariis Fratris Joannis Annii Viterbiensis, fol.* first published at Rome in 1498.—D.]

[† *Ethruscarum Antiquitatum Fragmenta, quibus urbis Romæ aliarumque gentium primordia, mores, et res gestæ indicantur, à Curtio Inghiramio reperta Scornelli prope Vulterram, fol. Francofurti,* 1637.—D.]

[‡ *Petronii Arbitri Fragmentum nuper Tragurii repertum,* 8vo. *Patavii,* 1664. —D.]

[§ *Pet. Arb. Satyricon, cum fragmentis Albæ Græcæ recuperatis anno* 1688. 12mo. *Col. Arg,* (*i. e.* Paris) 1691.]

I remember but one; and he tells the story but by halves, and is more *out of the way* than Galen himself. 'Tis Ammonius, in his Comment upon Aristotle's *Categories*. *'Tis reported*, says he, *that Philadelphus, being desirous to make a collection of all Aristotle's works* (*as indeed of all sorts of books whatsoever*) *gave good encouragement to those that could bring him any Treatise of that Philosopher's. Some therefore, with a design to get money of him, put Aristotle's name to other men's writings.*[j] Ammonius, we see, only speaks of books fathered upon Aristotle; which did not reach to my purpose. But Galen says it more fully, and yet as truly, of all writers of reputation.

But who would expect to see a point of History settled out of a Physician? (p. 29.) Any one that has read the works of that Physician; or even that single Tract of his, *About his own Books*;[k] such a one would know, that excellent author was not only a great man in his own faculty, but in all parts of learning. But what if he had been a mere Physician, like Aëtius or Aretæus? Is that a just exception, or the least diminution to his testimony? The Examiner has taken care very often in his Book to tell us of his *good breeding;* though it be one part of *good breeding*, not to value one's self upon it. Without doubt then he has added much to that character of himself, by this cast of his civility upon a whole profession at once.

But, it seems, I quote very *awkwardly; for I have fetched in a witness, that, after all, speaks against me* (p. 29). The passage in Galen that I refer to is this. *When the Attali and the Ptolemies were in emulation about their Libraries, the knavery of forging books and titles began. For there were those, that, to enhance the price of their books, put the*

[j] Ammon. p. 10. edit. Venet. 1546. Πτολεμαῖον τὸν Φιλάδελφον πάνυ σπουδακέναι φασὶ περὶ τὰ Ἀριστοτελικὰ συγγράμματα, ὡς καὶ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ, καὶ χρήματα διδόναι τοῖς προσφέρουσιν αὐτῷ βίβλους τοῦ φιλοσόφου· ὅθεν τινὲς χρηματίσασθαι βουλόμενοι, ἐπιγράφοντες συγγράμματα τῷ τοῦ φιλοσόφου ὀνόματι, προσῆγον.

[k] Περὶ τῶν ἰδίων βιβλίων.

names of great authors before them, and so sold them to those Princes.[l] This, I conceive, is an ample testimony, *that the practice of counterfeiting was then most in fashion,* which is the thing I produce him for. 'Tis true, as Mr. B. observes, Galen hints a little more than I had occasion to cite from him; for he says, this practice *began* at that time; which in another place he asserts more expressly; *That before the reigns of those Princes there was no such thing as a counterfeit book.*[m] Which assertion, taken strictly and without a candid allowance, is notoriously false: for we have several instances of such forgeries, not only practised by persons that lived before those times, but told us also by writers that lived before them. Ion Chius, the Tragic Poet, says, that Pythagoras made some Poems, and put Orpheus's name to them.[n] Herodotus denies that the Poem called CYPRIA is Homer's;[o] and others say, it's Stasinus's;[p] though Pindar ascribes it to Homer.[q] Aristoxenus mentions several spurious pieces, that were fathered upon Epicharmus.[r] Callimachus says, that OECHALIA CAPTA, a supposed Poem of Homer's, was really Creophylus the Samian's.[s] Heraclides of Pontus put forth his own Tragedies under Thespis's name.[t] And Heraclides himself was deservedly punished by Dionysius Metathemenos. For Dionysius made a Tragedy called *Parthenopæus,* and entitled it to Sophocles: which Heraclides was cheated with; and quoted it for ge-

[l] Ἐν τῷ κατὰ τοὺς Ἀτταλικούς τε καὶ Πτολεμαϊκοὺς βασιλέας χρόνῳ, πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀντιφιλοτιμουμένους περὶ κτήσεως βιβλίων, ἢ περὶ τὰς ἐπιγραφάς τε καὶ διασκευὰς αὐτῶν ἤρξατο γίγνεσθαι ῥᾳδιουργία τοῖς ἕνεκα τοῦ λαβεῖν ἀργύριον ἀναφέρουσιν ἐς τοὺς βασιλεῖς ἀνδρῶν ἐνδόξων συγγράμματα. Galen. Com. II. in Hip. de Nat. Hom.

[m] Οὐδέπω ψευδῶς ἐπεγέγραπτο σύγγραμμα. Com. I. in Hip. de Nat. Hom.

[n] Vide Laërt. in Pythag. et Clem. Alexand. Strom.

[o] Herod. lib. ii. c. 117.

[p] Athen. p. 334, 682. [=iii. 231.—v. 488. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

[q] Ælian. Var. Hist. ix. 15.

[r] Athen. lib. xiv. p. 648. [=v. 357. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

[s] Callimachus in Epigram. [=6. *ed. Blom.*—D.]

[t] Aristoxenus apud Laërt. in Heraclide.

nuine.[u] To these I will add that odd forgery of Anaximenes the Historian; though Pausanias be the oldest author now extant that relates it.[v] This Anaximenes, having a spite to his rival Historian Theopompus, wrote a bitter invective against the three most powerful governments of Greece, the Athenians, Lacedæmonians, and Thebans; where he exactly imitated Theopompus's style. This book he sends abroad in Theopompus's name, and so makes him odious all over Greece.

There are many more instances of such counterfeit writers: in one short passage of Suidas, there's an account of half a score.[w] But because the authors now extant, that mention them, were since the times of the Ptolemies, we have no certain demonstration, but that the forgeries also were since. But Galen lived at a time when those other books were in being, from which our authors now extant had the stories at second-hand. I can hardly therefore persuade myself, that the great Galen, with all his vast and diffused learning, could be ignorant of such obvious things. I would rather suppose, that when he says forgeries *began* in the times of the Ptolemies; he means it only of those that were practised to get money by. For both he and Ammonius particularly speak of those.[x] If this will not excuse Galen; I have nothing more to justify him: nor am I concerned in his mistake. For let us consider the charge that the Examiner draws up against me. *What I cite out of Galen, he acknowledges is there,* and is true; *but there is something else in Galen, which I do not cite, that is false.* Is not this a subtle accusation, and worthy of the ingenious Mr. B.? If I quote that author for one thing, must I therefore be concerned in all his other opinions? At this rate Mr. B. may

[u] Laërt. in Heraclide.

[v] Pausanias, Eliac. xi. p. 195.

[w] Suid. in Ὀρφεύς.

[x] Λαμβάνειν δ' ἀρξαμένων μισθῶν (leg. μισθὸν) τῶν κομιζόντων αὐτοῖς συγγράμματα παλαιοῦ τινὸς ἀνδρός. Galen.—Ὅθεν τινὲς χρηματίσασθαι βουλόμενοι. Ammon.

charge me with maintaining the doctrine of the four humours of the body, or with denying the circulation of the blood.

Some Critics in St. Hierom's time,[y] of the same stamp with our Examiner, would needs censure St. Paul in the very same manner. The Apostle[z] had cited a verse out of Epimenides;

Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί.

The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies.

This, said those censorious Critics, is to patronise idolatry; because the Poet in that passage calls them *liars* and *beasts* for refusing some idol worship. As if the Apostle, because he approves one single verse, must for that reason be supposed to espouse the whole context. If the Examiner consult Hierom, he will find there a very good answer both to those Critics and himself.

In the former Edition, I had said, that the Supplement of Petronius was pretended to be found at Buda. I had never seen that sorry imposture but once in a shop; and I was not much concerned to remember the title of it. I will take therefore our Examiner's word, for I have not seen the book since, that it pretends to come from Belgrade. Nor do I envy him the honour of being better acquainted with that worthy author than I am. But I wonder he would stop there; and not vindicate that Belgrade Fragment for a genuine piece. For, upon the same foot that he has defended his Phalaris, he may maintain all the cheats that ever were made, as I will shew at large in its proper place. If the Examiner therefore have longer life, with leisure and a good Assistant, we may hope for new editions of Berosus and Metasthenes, and the rest of that stamp: they will make a most noble set, and will deserve to stand together with Phalaris and Aristeas.

[y] Hieron. Comm. ad Titum. [z] Titus, i. 12.

That Sophist, whoever he was, that wrote a small Book of Letters in the name and character of Phalaris (give me leave to say this now, which I shall prove by and by), had not so bad a hand at humouring and personating, but that several believed it was the Tyrant himself that talked so big, and could not discover the Ass under the skin of that Lion. For we find Stobæus quoting the 38, and 67, and 72 of those *Epistles*, under the title of Phalaris (A).[a] And Suidas, in the account he gives of him, says, he has wrote *very admirable letters*, ἐπιστολὰς θαυμασίας πάνυ, meaning those that we are speaking of. And Johannes Tzetzes, a man of much rambling learning, has many and large extracts out of them in his *Chiliads;* ascribing them all to the Tyrant whose livery they wear. These three, I think, are the only men among the ancients that make any mention of them (B): but since they give not the least hint of any doubts concerning their author, we may conclude that most of the scholars of those ages received them as true originals; so that they have the general warrant and certificate for this last thousand years before the restoration of learning. As for the moderns, besides the approbation of those smaller critics that have been concerned in the editions of them, and cry them up of course; some very learned men have espoused and maintained them, such as Thomas Fazellus[b] and Jacobus Cappellus (C).[c] Even Mr. Selden himself[d] draws an argument in chronology from them, without discovering any suspicion or jealousy of a

[a] Stob. tit. vii. and xlvii.
[b] Historia Sicula, p. 118.
[c] Historia Sacra et Exotica, p. 249.
[d] Marm. Arundel. p. 106.

cheat. To whom I may add their latest and greatest advocate; who has honoured them with that most high character, prefixed to this Treatise.*

Others, indeed, have shewn their distrust of Phalaris's title to them; but are content to declare their sentiment without assigning their reasons. *Phalaris, or somebody else*, says Cælius Rhod.[e] *The Epistles that go under the name of Phalaris*, says Menagius.[f] Some name the very person at whose door they lay the forgery. *Lucian, whom they commonly mistake for Phalaris*, says Ang. Politianus.[g] *The Epistles of Phalaris, if they are truly his, and not rather Lucian's*, says Lilius Greg. Gyraldus;[h] who in another place informs us, that Politian's opinion had generally obtained among the learned of that age: *The Epistles*, says he, *of Phalaris, which most people attribute to Lucian.*[i] How judiciously they ascribe them to Lucian, we shall see better anon; after I have examined the case of Phalaris, who has the plea and right of possession. And I shall not go to dispossess him, as those have done before me, by an arbitrary sentence in his own tyrannical way; but proceed with him upon lawful evidence, and a fair, impartial trial. And I am very much mistaken in the nature and force of my proofs, if ever any man hereafter, that reads them, persist in his old opinion of making Phalaris an author (D).

The censures that are made from style and lan-

[* The passage in question from Sir W. Temple's *Essays*, which Bentley omitted in his enlarged work, will be found in the prefatory matter to this volume.—D.]

[e] Lib. iii. c. 7. [f] Ad Laërt. p. 35. [g] Epist. i.
[h] Poet. Hist. p. 88. [i] P. 332.

guage alone are commonly nice and uncertain, and depend upon slender notices. Some very sagacious and learned men have been deceived in those conjectures, even to ridicule. The great Scaliger* published a few Iambics, as a choice fragment of an old Tragedian, given him by Muretus; who soon after confessed the jest, that they were made by himself. Boxhornius writ a commentary upon a small poem *de Lite*, supposed by him to be some ancient author's; but it was soon discovered to be Michael Hospitalius's, a late Chancellor of France. So that, if I had no other argument but the style, to detect the spuriousness of Phalaris's *Epistles;* I myself, indeed, should be satisfied with that alone, but I durst not hope to convince every body else. I shall begin therefore with another sort of proofs, that will affect the most slow judgments, and assure the most timid or incredulous.

(A) To shew Stobæus's approbation of Phalaris's *Epistles*, I had observed, *that he quoted three of them under the title Phalaris*. The gentleman adds one more; and I should thank him for his liberality, had not any one of those three I mentioned been sufficient for my purpose. But when he says, *'Tis Tit.* CCXVIII. *and again in the Collection of Antonius and Maximus, and that I overlooked it* (p. 31); for that I must beg his pardon. For I could hardly overlook the 218th title of Stobæus, where there are but 121 in all. 'Tis not *Title* 218, but *Page* 218th;[j] and not of Stobæus, but of Antonius that is printed at the end of him.† But the Title

[* See *Scaliger in Varr. de Re Rust.* p. 212. *ed. Steph.* 1573.—D.]

[j] Edit. Genev. 1609.

[† " Mr. Boyle and his assistants are so often in the wrong, that it is barely " doing justice to defend them when they are in the right. Boyle used the

of Stobæus, that the Examiner would cite, is LXXXIV. How far *the Assistant, that consulted books* for the Examiner (Præf.), may be chargeable with this mistake; or how far it goes towards a discovery that Mr. B. himself never looked into Stobæus, I will leave it for others to determine.

(B) *These three,* said I, (*Stobæus, Suidas, and Tzetzes*) *I think, are the only men among the Ancients that make any mention of them.* I am sensible, how hazardous it is to publish books in great haste; where 'tis impossible not to commit some oversight or mistake. I could then call to mind three only; but the Examiner and his Assistant have found as many more; Photius in his *Epistles,* the Scholiast on Aristophanes, and Nonnus upon Greg. Nazianzen (p. 30). For his first author, Photius, I must own myself obliged to him; because that learned Patriarch plainly *intimates his suspicions* (as Mr. B. well observes), *that the Epistles are not genuine,* when he says, *they are attributed to Phalaris* (p. 32).[k] This is honest and just in the gentleman (though he ridicules it in others) *to fetch in a witness, that after all speaks against him* (p. 29). Out of gratitude therefore for this fair dealing, I'll tell him something about his other two authors, that perhaps he is not yet aware of.

First, The passage that is quoted out of the Scholiast on Aristophanes[l] (with the Examiner's leave) is spurious:

" Franckfort edition of Stobæus, fol. 1581, in which the collections of *Stobæus,* " *Antonius,* and *Maximus,* are blended together, so that the title of Stobæus, " where the quotation from Phalaris occurs, is in other editions the 84th, but " in the Franckfort the 218th. The 217th title belongs to Antonius and Maxi- " mus, and there is found the same quotation. The singular coincidence of the " number 218 led Bentley into this mistake." PORSON, in his *Tracts,* &c. *ed. by Kidd,* p. 314.—D.]

[k] Τὰς εἰς Φάλαριν ἐκεῖνον, οἶμαι, τὸν Ἀκραγάντινον τύραννον ἀναφερομένας ἐπιστολάς. Phot. Ep. 207.

[l] Aristoph. Plut. ver. 142. Καταλύω, τὸ ἀφανίζω καὶ διαλύω . . . ὃς κἀκεῖθα. καὶ ὁ Φάλαρις· εἰ βούλεσθε ἐμὲ τὸν πρὸς ὑμᾶς καταλῦσαι πόλεμον. See Phal. Ep. 5. [ἐμὲ not in Schol.—D.]

for there are other things not genuine, besides *Phalaris's Epistles*. 'Tis not extant in Aldus's original edition[m] set out by Musurus, but was foisted in by the overseer of the press at Florence, and copied out afterwards at Basil and Geneva. And to shew that it was not taken out of some ancient MS. (as perhaps the Examiner will be ready to say) the same person has interpolated four passages more, but all out of printed books, Galen,[n] Athenæus,[o] and Eustathius.[p] From the last of which authors there hangs an observation. The Examiner, after he has cited this Scholiast on Aristophanes, thus flourishes and insults; *That very Scholiast, whom, one would think, the Doctor, by his citing him so often, had thoroughly read* (p. 31). Now some perhaps may think still, and the rather upon this very account, that the Doctor had thoroughly read him; but that our Examiner had not, I have a small proof from his own words. *This Scholiast*, says he, *is some centuries older than Suidas* (p. 31). Now how could he say this, had he known that this Scholiast had cited Eustathius, who is some centuries *younger* than Suidas? For I suppose it appears manifestly, that the gentleman had no apprehension that the passage was foisted in.

But some have thought Suidas younger than Eustathius himself. That point therefore must be settled; for we have to deal with a shifting adversary, that, to avoid a thing which presses him, will strike in with any opinion. Eustathius is known to have lived A.D. 1180. As for Suidas,[q] he has brought down a point of Chronology to the death of the Emperor Zimisces, that is, to the year of Christ 975. So that he seems to have writ his Lexicon between that time and the death of the succeeding Emperor, which was 1025. Wolfius indeed brings him much lower; for he says, he

[m] Ven. 1498. [n] Edit. Basil. p. 48. [o] P. 52, 65.
[p] P. 52.
[q] Suid. v. Ἀδάμ. Ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Πορφυρογεννήτου ἕως τῆς τελευτῆς Ἰωάννου τοῦ Τζιμισκῆ, ἔτη κε. lege ἔτη ιε.

cites Metochita Logotheta,[r] that lived in the beginning of the 14th century, in the times of the Palæologi. To whom learned men have answered, that that passage, or any other of that sort, may be supposed to have been foisted in since Suidas's death. But the whole thing is a mistake of Wolfius's. For the places he hinted at are in the words *Ἄβαξι* and *Νοθεύει*, where Logotheta indeed is quoted; but not the Logotheta that Wolfius understood, Theodorus Metochita Logotheta, that died 1332; but Symeon Metaphrastus Logotheta, that flourished in the beginning of the 10th century. The words are, *Logotheta in the Martyrdom of St. Thecla:*[s] and *The Exposition of Logotheta upon the Martyrdom of St. Lucian.*[t] Where the very word *exposition*, *μετάφρασις*, is a plain indication, that he means Symeon called *Μεταφραστής*; but, which is certain demonstration, those two Discourses of Symeon's are extant at this day. The reader too may be pleased to observe, that our author calls Symeon *μακαρίτης*, *of blessed memory*, which I believe is never used in Greek but of persons not long dead, and within the memory of him that says it. But Symeon was in office under Leo, who died 58 years before Suidas's chronology ends. If Suidas then was Symeon's contemporary, he must have made his book *soon* after the death of Zimisces; 200 years before Eustathius.

And then for the Examiner's other author, which he would give me the credit of, *Nonnus, in his Commentary on Gregory's Invective;* I thank him for his kind offer, but I cannot accept of it. That poor writer is not Nonnus the Poet, the Author of the *Dionysiacs* and the *Paraphrase* of St. John's Gospel, as learned men,[u] and, if I may presume

[r] Atque adeo, cùm Metochitam Logothetam citet, qui sub Palæologis vixit, apparet eum vix annis abhinc 300 Lexicon hoc composuisse. Hieron. Wolf. in Præfat. ad Suid. A. D. 1544.

[s] Ὁ Λογοθέτης ἐν τῷ τῆς ἁγίας Θέκλης μαρτυρίῳ. Suid. v. Ἄβαξι.

[t] Ἐν τῇ τοῦ μακαρίτου Λογοθέτου μεταφράσει, τῇ εἰς τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ ἁγίου Λουκιανοῦ. Suid. v. Νοθεύει.

[u] Simlerus in Biblioth. Dr. Cave. See Catal. Biblioth. Oxon. &c.

to guess, Mr. B. himself have believed. 'Tis true, I am no admirer of that Poet; I have the same opinion of his judgment and style, that Scaliger, and Cunæus, and Heinsius had. But he had great variety of learning, and may pass for an able Grammarian, though a very ordinary Poet. And I can never think so very mean of him, as to make him writer of that Commentary, so full of shameful mistakes. That Commentator interprets τὰς Φρυγῶν ἐκτομάς,[v] *the castration of the Phrygians*, to be the slashing and cutting their limbs. He says, Anaxarchus was pounded in a mortar by Archelaus the tyrant.[w] Here's Archelaus of Macedonia, instead of Nicocreon of Cyprus. Besides that Archelaus was dead above 60 years before Anaxarchus's time. When he explains Ἐπικτήτου σκέλος in Gregory,[x] he says, *Epictetus's leg was put in chains by a certain tyrant.*[y] He knew not, it seems, that common story, that Epictetus was lame of one leg; and not by chains and imprisonment, but merely by a rheumatism. He says, *Plato in Theætetus* and *every where* brings in Socrates saying ὅτι καλὸς ὁ Θεαίτητος, *Theætetus is handsome.*[z] Whereas Plato says directly the contrary, Νῦν δὲ οὐκ ἔστι καλὸς ὁ Θεαίτητος, *Theætetus is not handsome;*[a] as having a flat nose and goggle eyes. But the merriest fancy of this writer is this very story of Phalaris, with which Mr. B. would enrich my Dissertation. *Phalaris*, says he, *to ingratiate himself with Dionysius the Tyrant, invented the Brazen Bull, and presented it to him. But Dionysius, detesting the cruelty of the invention, made the first experiment upon Phalaris himself.*[b] Mr. B. who is for drawing down Phalaris as low as he can, should have struck in methinks with this writer, who has drawn him down with a vengeance, even to Dionysius's time, the XCIV. Olymp. the space of above sixscore years. Now, I conceive, it will be easily allowed, that Nonnus the Poet could not be guilty of

[v] Num. 5. edit. Eton.
[w] Num. 15.
[x] P. 37.
[y] Num. 14.
[z] Num. 22.
[a] Plato in Theæt.
[b] Num. 48.

these mistakes. But there are two errors of this Commentator, that we have the Poet's own assurance he could not have committed. Gregory says *ἡ Κασταλία σεσίγηται, the Castalian Fountain is put to silence.*[c] This, the Commentator says, is *Castalia at Antioch.*[d] But the Poet would have known it to be *Castalia of Parnassus;* as these verses of his will witness:

Καὶ ῥία Παρνήσσοιο τινάσσετο φοιβάδος ἠχοῦς
Γείτονος εἰσαΐοντα, καὶ ὀμφήεντι ῥεέθρῳ
Κασταλίης πάφλαζε νοήμονος ἔνθεον ὕδωρ.[e]

The Commentator calls Bacchus *Ζαγραῖος*, which is barbarous, instead of *Ζαγρεύς.*[f] But the Poet writes it true, in a hundred places of his book;

Ἀρχεγόνῳ Ζαγρῆϊ καὶ ὀψιγόνῳ Διονύσῳ.

If the Commentary then carry the name of Nonnus, it must needs be some other Nonnus, and not the Author of the *Dionysiacs.* Billius,[g] who first published it, out of a Library at Rhemes, calls it *Patris Nonni collectio,* &c. In Possevin's Catalogue of the MSS. of the Escurial,[h] it is *Nonnus Abbas de Narrationibus,* &c. Bishop Mountague, that first printed it in Greek, had it out of the Library at Vienna; and he ascribes it to Nonnus, upon the credit, I suppose, of Billius. For the original that he followed had no name at all; as it appears from his own edition,[i] and from Lambecius's Catalogue.[j] Tzetzes in his *Chiliads* cites this very book; but he attributes it to one Maximus.

Περὶ τοῦ λέγοντος χρησμοῦ τὰς Θετταλὰς τὰς ἵππους,
Μέμνηται μὲν καὶ Μάξιμος ἱστοριῶν τοῖς λόγοις,
Ἃς ἱστορίας ἔγραψε Γρηγόριος ὁ μέγας·
Ἔπος δ' οὐδὲν οὐδὲ βραχὺ τῶν τοῦ χρησμοῦ εἰρήκει.[*]

[c] P. 104. [d] Num. 14. Part. 2. [e] Nonni Dionys. iv. p. 130.
[f] Num. 29. [g] In oper. Nazian. [h] Possev. Apparat. vol. ii.
[i] P. 127. [j] Lib. iii. p. 207.
[* *Chil.* ix. 864. p. 357. *ed. Kiessling.*—D.]

Maximus, says he, *in his Commentary upon the Histories in Gregory, mentions the oracle about the Thessalian mares; but produces not one single verse of it.* If the Examiner look in Gregory, p. 69, and in the Comment. *Numb.* 74. he will learn, what perhaps he knew not before, that John Tzetzes means no other Commentary than this very Nonnus, the Examiner's noble present to me.

(C) 'Tis a keen reflection of Mr. B., *That I name Fazellus, Cappellus, and Selden, not as a modest man would expect; but only to shew how impossible it was for them to judge right, who had the misfortune to live before me* (p. 32). I wish the gentleman had shewed his own *modesty* a little more in this particular. For what can *any man expect* from him, that will talk thus against his own knowledge? In the very same page I have cited Rhodoginus, Politian, Gyraldus, and the *most* of that age, as falling in with my own opinion, that Phalaris is spurious. And yet I am said to suggest, that Fazellus and the rest could not *possibly* judge right, as having nobody to inform them, till I wrote upon the subject: though the youngest of those that judged right, whom I have cited in the same place, is older than the eldest of these that judged wrong.

(D) The Examiner shall see, that I will not persist in an error, when I am plainly confuted. I was persuaded, when I wrote my *Dissertation, That nobody that read it would believe Phalaris an author.* Here, I must confess, I was in a mistake. For the Examiner, who assures us, *he has read it and weighed it* (p. 33), has writ a book of 200 pages to vindicate *his Sicilian Prince* (p. 43). But then, whether, as I said, *I was mistaken in the nature and force of my proofs,* or rather in the nature and force of my adversary; I leave that to the judgment of others.

The time of Phalaris's tyranny cannot be precisely determined: so various and defective are the

accounts of those that write of him. Eusebius sets the beginning of it Olymp. XXXI. 2. *Phalaris apud Agrigentinos tyrannidem exercet;* and the end of it Olymp. XXXVIII. 2. *Phalaridis tyrannis destructa.* By which reckoning he governed XXVIII.* years (A). But St. Hierom, out of some unknown chronologer (for that note is not extant in the Greek of Eusebius), gives a different time of his reign, above LXXX. years later than the other; Olymp. LIII. 4.; or, as other copies read it, LII. 2. *Phalaris tyrannidem exercuit annos* XVI. Which is agreeable to Suidas, who places him *κατὰ τὴν νβ' Ὀλυμπιάδα, about the* LII. *Olympiad.* If the former account be admitted, the cheat is manifest at first sight; for those Letters of Phalaris to Stesichorus and Pythagoras must of necessity be false. Because Stesichorus, by the earliest account, was but VI. years old at that supposed time of Phalaris's death; and Pythagoras was not taken notice of in Greece till LXXX. years after it (B). But for the sake of Aristotle and Jamblichus, the first of whom makes Phalaris contemporary with Stesichorus, and the other with Pythagoras; and that I may prevent all possible cavils and exceptions; I am willing to allow the later account, the more favourable to the pretended *Letters:* his government commencing Olymp. LIII. 4., and expiring after XVI. years, Olymp. LVII. 3.

(A) Mr. B. will not enter the controversy about Phalaris's age; but refers himself to another person to settle that point for him. But, however, he will nibble at some

[* Old ed. "XXXVIII."—While Bentley (see the opposite page) corrected one error of the press, he allowed another to creep in.—D.]

passages of this section, to shew his own great wit; though he borrows another man's great reading.

In the former edition, for XXXVIII. 2. it was printed XXXVII. 2. (p. 118.) Now a man of sense and honour would have passed this over, as a plain fault of the press; as it appeared from Eusebius, who is quoted for it, and from my allowing the sum of XXVIII. years for Phalaris's reign, which in the other way is but XXIV. And yet the Examiner animadverts on it for ten lines together. But at last, he is willing *to suppose* XXXVII. *a false print;* which he does not out of justice and sincerity (let not the reader mistake him), but to draw on another cavil against the following passage, a cavil that would not succeed if XXXVII. were truly printed.

The case is thus: I had said, if Olymp. XXXVIII. 2. was the time of Phalaris's death, that Letter to Pythagoras must be spurious, for he was not *taken notice of* in Greece till 80 years after. But, for Jamblichus's sake, who made those two to be *contemporaries,* I would allow the later account, Olymp. LVII. 3. for Phalaris's death. Here the gentleman has proved by the dint of arithmetic, that I contradict myself: for, by adding those 80 years to Ol. XXXVIII. 2., the product is Ol. LVIII. 2. Phalaris then was three years dead, before Pythagoras was taken notice of. They could not therefore be *acquainted,* as I said I would allow for Jamblichus's sake. But here the gentleman makes use of a certain slight of hand, that is not fashionable among men of honour. He takes away the word *contemporary,* and in its room puts in *acquaintance.* Now that's a point I need not allow, neither for Jamblichus's sake nor Mr. B.'s, that Phalaris and Pythagoras had any *acquaintance* together. I granted, they were *contemporaries;* and 'tis not improbable that the tradition about their acquaintance was grounded upon that truth, that they lived at the same time. And I imagine they might, nay they must, have been *contemporaries,* if the one died but three years before the other was *famous.*

The Examiner, not content with this, makes a step out of his way, *to shew another instance of my inconsistency about Xerxes's expedition* (p. 119). He says, *I put it*[k] *in one place at Olymp.* LXXIII. Here again the controversy lies between him and my printer, who for LXXV. I. (by mistaking the two strokes of v) made it LXXIII. But his next attack is made upon myself. Pag. 85th, I say, *the very next Olymp. after Xerxes's expedition, Hiero was in the throne; and I quote Diodorus for it. But Diodorus says in that very place,*[l] *that Hiero came to the throne Olymp.* LXXV. 3. *Therefore here I am of opinion, that Xerxes's expedition was Olymp.* LXXIV. *And yet Diodorus and I myself elsewhere place it Olymp.* LXXV. See the penetration of our Examiner, if he once set about it. He makes *coming to* the throne, and *being in* the throne, to have the same signification. For the sum of his argument lies thus; *Hiero* CAME *to the throne Olymp.* LXXV.; *therefore it cannot be said, he* WAS *in the throne Olymp.* LXXVI. Was there ever such a dangerous disputant? Upon the same foot he may argue all the princes in Christendom out of their thrones, if they are past the first year of their reigns. But it is well for them, that in his second Edition this terrible paragraph is left out. Neither should I have raised it up again out of its dust; but for the sake of those that may never see his second Edition; and to shew it possible, even by Mr. B.'s own confession, that his animadversions may have other faults, besides satire and abuse.

To take a short leave then of the Examiner; the very learned Mr. Dodwell, to whose Book now in the press Mr. B. has made his appeal for settling the time of Phalaris, was pleased, at my request, to oblige me with a sight of those sheets of his Book, where this question is handled. And there I find, that learned man has not only brought Phalaris down to Olymp. LXXII. 3. which is LX. years lower than chronologers had placed him before; but he has as-

[k] P. 24. first edit.

[l] Lib. xi. p. 39.

serted the *Epistles* too to be Phalaris's own. I have leave to say, this part of his Book was printed before my *Dissertation* was made; so that only two of my arguments, and not those neither in the manner that I urge them, are here considered by Mr. Dodwell. But we may expect that, in an Appendix to that noble work, he will pass a judgment upon the whole controversy.

To inquire then as accurately as we can, into the Age of Phalaris; first, we have the authority of Eusebius and Hierom, who have furnished us with two accounts from different authors.

Ol. XXXI. 2. *Phalaris's tyranny began.*[m]

Ol. XXXVIII. 2. *Phalaris's tyranny ended.*[n]

Ol. LIII. 4. *Phalaris held his tyranny* XVI. *years.*[o]

Which XVI. years expire at Olymp. LVII. 3.

In all my *Dissertation* I have reckoned by this later account; though some of the MS. copies of Eusebius date it VI. years before.[p] But I was resolved to avoid cavils, as much as lay in my power, and to shew all reasonable favour to the pretended *Epistles*.

If we trace the footsteps of Phalaris's age in the remains of other authors, I believe we shall find that there is no good warrant or authority to bring it down nearer to us than this last period of Eusebius.

Syncellus puts the whole time of Phalaris within the bounds of Phraortes and Cyaxares's reigns, that is, between Olymp. XXXI. and XLVII.

Phalaris was Tyrant of Agrigentum.[q]

Phalaris was deposed from his tyranny.[r]

Now, though we should extend Phalaris's life to the very

[m] Phalaris apud Agrigentinos tyrannidem exercuit.

[n] Phalaridis tyrannis destructa.

[o] Phalaris tyrannidem exercuit ann. XVI.

[p] See Pontacus's edition of Euseb.

[q] Syncellus in Chron. *Φάλαρις Ἀκραγαντίνων ἐτυράννησε.*

[r] *Φάλαρις τυραννῶν κατελύθη.*

last day of Cyaxares; yet it will end XLI. years earlier than by Eusebius's reckoning.

Suidas says, *He was Tyrant over all Sicily, about the* LII. *Olymp.*[s] Now allow, that he *began* his tyranny at that time, though the words do not import so much; the interval between this and Eusebius's period is XXIII. years, a very competent length for the duration of his reign.

Orosius fixes his age to the beginning of Cyrus's reign, after Astyages was deposed.[t] But Cyrus's reign commences Olymp. LV. 1. which falls XI. years within Eusebius's period.

Pliny says, *The first Tyrant in the world was Phalaris at Agrigentum.*[u] This account will carry his age as high or higher than the earlier period in Eusebius, Ol. XXXI. 2. For Cypselus made himself Tyrant of Corinth Olymp. XXXI. 3.;[v] or, as others say, XXX. 3.[w] But at least it will secure it from sinking below the later period, LIII. 4. For there was good store of Tyrants in the world before and about that time. To mention a few of them; Periander succeeded his father Cypselus at Corinth[x] Olymp. XXXVIII. And he married the daughter of Proclees[y] Tyrant of Epidaurus. He had a namesake, a cousin-german,[z] that was Tyrant of Ambracia; and an acquaintance with Thrasybulus,[a] who was Tyrant of Miletus. Pittacus was Tyrant of Lesbos[b] Olymp. XLVII. 3. And he slew Melanchrus[c] Olymp. XLII., who was Tyrant there before him. This Melanchrus, I believe, is meant in that verse in Hephæstion:[d]

Μέλαγχρος αἰδὼς ἄξιος ἐς πόλιν.

[s] Suid. v. Φαλ. *τυραννήσας Σικελίας ὅλης κατὰ τὴν νβ ὀλυμπιάδα.*

[t] Oros. i. 20. Eâ tempestate, Phalaris Siculus Agrigentinos arrepta tyrannide depopulabatur.

[u] Plin. Hist. Nat. vii. 56. Tyrannus primus fuit Phalaris Agrigenti.

[v] Herodot. Diog. Laërt. [w] Arist. Polit. [x] Aristot. Laërt.

[y] Laërt. in Periand. Herodot. [z] Laërt. ibid. Arist. Polit.

[a] Herod. Plut. Conviv. VII. Sap. Laërt.

[b] Laërt. in Pittaco. [c] Laërt. ibid. Suid. v. Πίτταχος.

[d] Hephæst. Enchir. p. 46. [= 80. *ed. Gaisf.*—D.]

For it appears plainly to be a verse of Alcæus's, who with his brothers assisted Pittacus in killing Melanchrus.[e] Tynnondas was Tyrant of Eubœa[f] before the year that Solon was Archon, which was Olymp. XLVI. 3. But there is one that 'tis almost impossible Pliny should forget, I mean Pisistratus Tyrant of Athens, who began his government Olymp. LIV. 4.[g] They will put an affront then upon that great Historian and Naturalist, who shall attempt to bring Phalaris lower than the later period in Eusebius.

But I believe the age of Phalaris may be best of all determined out of Pindar and his Scholiast. Pindar, in an Ode to Theron Tyrant of Agrigentum, calls him and his family Ἐμμενίδαι, *Emmenidæ*.[h] Which the Scholiast thus explains: "*Emmenidæ, the family of Theron. Telemachus, that* "DEPOSED PHALARIS *Tyrant of Agrigentum, was the father* "*of Emmenides, he of Ænesidamus, he of Theron and Xeno-* "*crates. Theron's son was Thrasydæus, and Xenocrates's* "*Thrasybulus.*"[i]

The genealogy lies thus:

1. *Telemachus*, who deposed *Phalaris*.
2. *Emmenides*.
3. *Ænesidamus*.
4. *Theron*. } { 4. *Xenocrates*.
5. *Thrasydæus*. } { 5. *Thrasybulus*.

These being descended in a direct line, the son from the father; if we can but certainly fix the age of any one of them, we may gather from thence the time of the first, and consequently of Phalaris that was deposed by him. For, allowing thirty years for every generation,[j] or rather an hun-

[e] Laërt. [f] Plutarch. in Solone. [g] Marm. Arundel.

[h] —— Ἐμὲ δ' ὧν πα
Θυμὸς ὀτρύνει φάμεν, Ἐμμενίδαις
Θήρωνί τ' ἐλθεῖν | κῦδος. Pind. III. Olymp.

[i] Τηλεμάχου, καταλύσαντος τὸν τῶν Ἀκραγαντίνων τύραννον Φάλαριν, παῖς γίνεται Ἐμμενίδης, οὗ Αἰνησίδαμος, οὗ Θήρων καὶ Ξενοκράτης. Θήρωνος δὲ, Θρασυδαῖος, Ξενοκράτους δὲ, Θρασύβουλος. Schol. ad locum.

[j] Eustath. et Schol. vetus ad α' Iliad. Οἱ παλαιοὶ τὰς γενεὰς ἐψήφιζον ἕως ἐτῶν τριάκοντα.

dred years to three generations,[k] which was the common rule and measure set by the ancient historians, we shall come at last to the period we seek for.

The same genealogy is repeated again in the Scholia upon the Fifth Ode of Pyth., out of an ancient historian, Hippostratus, *who wrote a Treatise of the Sicilian families*:[l] only here, by an error of the copier, Ænesidamus is left out of the list. But that it is no more than a bare omission of the scribe, is apparent from that other passage above, and from Pindar[m] himself, and Herodotus; both of whom, being contemporaries with Theron, call him the son of Ænesidamus.

There's a third table of Theron's pedigree, in the Second Ode of Olymp., where Pindar saying, *that Theron's family was derived from Thersander;* the Scholiast reckons the whole stem of them thus: "*Œdipus, Polynices, Thersander,* "*Tisamenus, Antesion,*[n] *Theras, Samus,* who had two sons, "*Clytius,* who dwelt in the island Thera, and *Telemachus,* "*who went with some forces to Sicily, and settled himself* "*there.*"[o] The descendants of

1. *Telemachus* are,
2. *Chalciopeus.*
3. *Ænesidamus.*
4. *Theron.*

'Tis observable, that he that was named Emmenides above is here called Chalciopeus. But this difference is of no consequence in our present inquiry, since in both ac-

[k] Herod. ii. c. 142. Γενεαὶ τρεῖς ἀνδρῶν ἑκατὸν ἔτεά ἐστι. Clemens Alex. Strom. i. Εἰς μέντοι τὰ ἑκατὸν ἔτη τρεῖς καταλέγονται γενεαί. So Dionys. Halicarnas. l. i. p. 120. from Numa Olymp. xvi. 3. to Pythagoras Olymp. l. 1. which makes 134 years, are τέσσαρες ὅλαι γενεαί, four generations.

[l] Ἱππόστρατος ὁ τὰ περὶ Σικελίας γενεαλογῶν.

[m] Pind. ii. Olymp. πρέπει τὸν Αἰνησιδάμου, speaking of Theron. Herod. vii. 165. Θήρωνος τοῦ Αἰνησιδάμου Ἀκραγαντίνων μουνάρχου.

[n] In the Scholiast here, it's Ἀντεσίων; but the true reading is Αὐτεσίων. See Herodotus, p. 350. Apollodorus, p. 142. Pausanias in several places; and the Scholiast himself, on Pyth. iv.—[*Addenda.*]

[o] Πολλάξας δύναμιν, ἔρχεται εἰς Σικελίαν, καὶ κρατεῖ τῶν τόπων.

counts there is the same number of persons. Nay, we have the firmer ground to go upon for this little variation. For because these differing genealogies must have been taken from different authors; we have now a double authority for the number of the generations.

To proceed then in our search after some characters of time. Xenocrates, of the IVth generation, got the prize at the Pythian games in Pythiad the XXIV., which falls in with Olymp. LXXII. 3.[p] Supposing then that Xenocrates was but XXX. years old at the time of that victory, and Telemachus XL. when he deposed Phalaris; which is an allowance very favourable in behalf of the *Epistles;* there's yet an interval of fourscore and ten years, and Phalaris's death must be placed at Olymp. L. 1. which is above the period of Eusebius.

But we have more notes of time, relating to his brother Theron. He was victor[q] at the Olympian games Olymp. LXXVII., and died the same year, in the XVIth of his reign.[r] So that he came to the crown Olymp. LXXIII. 1. He had a daughter Demarete, that was married to Gelon Tyrant of Syracuse before LXXV. 1.[s] Let Theron then be XLII. years old when he entered upon his government, which is an allowance scanty enough, since he had not the crown by succession, but obtained it by policy and interest;[t] and let his daughter Demarete be XX. years of age at Olymp. LXXV., and Telemachus XL. as before, when Phalaris was deposed: the collected number of years is CX.; which will carry Phalaris's death as high as Olymp. XLVII. 2.

Thus, we see, Eusebius, Hierom, Syncellus, Orosius, Suidas, Pliny, Hippostratus, and the Scholiast on Pindar, are all pretty well agreed in placing the time of Phalaris's

[p] Pindar. Schol. ad II. Isth. Οὗτος δὲ ὁ Ξενοκράτης οὐ μόνον Ἴσθμια νενίκηκεν ἵπποις, ἀλλὰ καὶ Πύθια τὴν εἰκοστὴν τετάρτην Πυθιάδα, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης ἀναγράφει. See too, ad VI. Pyth.

[q] Schol. Pindari ad II. Olymp.

[r] Diodor. Sic. p. 39.

[s] Diodor. p. 21. Timæus apud Schol. Pindar. II. Olymp.

[t] Polyænus, lib. vi.

death above the LVIII. Olympiad. And there will be occasion of adding several remarks in confirmation of their testimony; as we examine the opinion of the learned Mr. Dodwell.

The sum of his first argument[u] for bringing Phalaris down so much lower, turns upon these authorities.

"Phalaris was contemporary with Stesichorus;[v] and sur-
"vived him.[w] But Stesichorus was alive Olymp. LXXIII. 3."[x]

Where, without doubt, the reader has already observed, that the principal part of the argument, *Stesichorus's surviving of Phalaris*, is plainly begging the question. For it has no voucher but the *Epistles* of Phalaris, the very book that's under debate. This particular then must be laid aside; and without it, the whole argument has no force at all. For Stesichorus might be alive Olymp. LXXIII. 3., and yet be contemporary with Phalaris, even by Eusebius's account. Stesichorus lived to be LXXXV. years old.[y] He might be XXI. then at Olymp. LVII. 3., the time of Phalaris's death according to Eusebius.

Nay, the other branches of this argument are either for us, or at least not against us. Tzetzes, who says Phalaris lived in Stesichorus' and Pythagoras's time,[z] is a witness of no credit in this particular; for, as Mr. D. himself acknowledges, he had it from the *Epistles*, which he often cites in his *Chiliads*. And Aristotle's story[a] of Stesichorus's fable about the Horse and the Stag, when the Himeræans had made Phalaris their general, and were going to allow him a guard, is a little to be suspected; because Conon, a writer in Julius Cæsar's time, gives us the very same narrative, but, instead of Phalaris, he says it was Gelon that Stesichorus spoke of.[b] And the circumstances of Gelon's history seem to countenance Conon. For Gelon was in great favour and esteem with the Himeræans. When their city was besieged

[u] De Cyclis V. Diss. v. sect. 10.
[v] Aristot. Jo. Tzetzes.
[w] Phal. Ep.
[x] Marm. Arund.
[y] Lucian. in Macrob.
[z] Ad Hesiod. p. 3.
[a] Arist. in Rhetor.
[b] Conon, Narrat. 42.

by Himilco, Olymp. LXXV. 1., he came and raised the siege with a total defeat of all the Carthaginian forces.[c] Upon which almost all the cities of Sicily, even those that had opposed him before, came and made their submission to him. Stesichorus then might say his fable upon that occasion; or perhaps long before, upon some other account that we now know not of, before Gelon obtained the government of Syracuse. If we suppose then, with the Arundel Marble, that Stesichorus lived Olymp. LXXIII. 3., it exactly agrees with the age of Gelon, and Conon's account of the story may seem more credible than Aristotle's. And then all the argument, that would settle Phalaris's age from the time of Stesichorus, will vanish into nothing.

But, if any one will pay so much deference to the deserved authority of Aristotle, as to believe the story upon his word, I will not contest it with him. Let it be true then, that Stesichorus made this speech upon Phalaris. So far is this from being a reason to bring Phalaris lower, that it rather ties and fastens him up to the period of Eusebius. For Suidas says, Stesichorus was born Olymp. XXXVII. and died LVI., which makes him fourscore years of age; and wants but five years of Lucian's reckoning. Eusebius places him higher still; for he says, he flourished Olymp. XLII. 1. and died Olymp. LV. 1. All this is confirmed by another passage of Suidas, where he says, Simonides was *μετὰ Στησίχορον τοῖς χρόνοις, after Stesichorus's time*;[d] as in another place he says, *Stesichorus was after Alcman's time.*[e] Now as Alcman, who flourished Olymp. XXVII., was dead when Stesichorus was born, Olymp. XXXVII.; so Stesichorus died Olymp. LVI., the very time that Simonides was born according to Suidas. If we admit therefore of these testimonies about Stesichorus's age, and of Aristotle's testimony about

[c] Diod. xi. p. 18 and 21.

[d] V. Σιμωνίδης.

[e] Τοῖς δὲ χρόνοις ἦν νεώτερος Ἀλκμᾶνος τοῦ λυρικοῦ. Suid. v. Στησιχ. Cyril. contra Jul. Ol. μβ. Στησίχορος ἐγνωρίζετο.

his transaction with Phalaris, both together make a new argument for the period of Eusebius.

But then the Arundel Marble lies cross in our way, that makes *Stesichorus come into Greece* no sooner than Olymp. LXXIII. 3.[f] I have a great veneration for that incomparable monument; but I cannot but dissent from it in this particular, both upon the authorities already produced, and for a reason that I will now propose, and submit to the reader's judgment. Simonides, as I will shew immediately, was no less than LXXII. years old Olymp. LXXIII. 3., the year that Stesichorus came into Greece according to the Marble. And I think that even Stesichorus himself can scarce be supposed older; for LXXII. is a competent age to undertake such a long voyage. Simonides then, if the Marble say true, was as old as Stesichorus: but we have Simonides's own word to the contrary, where he cites Stesichorus in company with Homer, as an ancient author:[g] he is speaking of Meleager:

> Ὃς δουρὶ πάντας νίκασε νέους
> Δινάεντα βαλὼν Ἄναυρον ὕπερ
> Πολυβότρυος ἐξ Ἰωλκοῦ.
> Οὕτω γὰρ Ὅμηρος ἠδὲ Στησίχορος | ἄεισε λαοῖς.

That excelled all the young men in casting the javelin, throwing it from Iolcus over the river Anaurus; as Homer and Stesichorus sung to the people. Now I appeal to any man of judgment and acquaintance with the writings of the ancients, if he can think Simonides would speak thus of one of his contemporary lyrics. They were all rivals and enemies one

[f] Ἀφ' οὗ Στησίχορος ὁ ποιητὴς εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀφίκετο. Marm. Arund.

[g] Apud Athenæum, lib. iv. p. 172. [= ii. 170. *ed. Schw.* —
"Lege,

> ὃς ———— δουρὶ πάντας
> νίκασε νέους ὑπὲρ δι-
> νάεντα βαλὼν Ἄναυρον, κ. τ. λ.

Sunt sex Ionici à majore." *Dobree, Advers.* ii. 366.—D.]

to another. Pindar sometimes makes reflections upon Bacchylides, and this Simonides that we are speaking of;[h] and 'tis always to their disparagement. Much less then would Simonides's covetous humour that the ancients tax him of,[i] which made him envy all that intercepted any gain from him, have suffered him to do honour to Stesichorus, in joining him with Homer, had that Himeræan been then alive to have rivalled him in his trade. Perhaps it may be objected, that Simonides, though he was of a good age at Olymp. LXXIII. 3. might not be an author till afterwards; and so Stesichorus might be dead before Simonides set up for a poet. But Herodotus[j] gives an answer to this, when he says, that Simonides made odes upon Eualcidas of Eretria for his victories at the Olympian or some of the other games. For Eualcidas was killed[k] just after the burning of Sardes, which was Olymp. LXIX. So that Simonides was famed for his poetry for at least twenty years before Stesichorus came into Greece, according to the Marble.

It remains now, that I give an account of Simonides's age. There are three periods in the Arundel Marble, where Simonides is mentioned.

1. Olymp. LXXII. 4. *Simonides, the grandfather of Simonides the Poet, a poet too himself, ... at Athens.*[l]

2. Olymp. LXXV. 3. *Simonides, the son of Leoprepes, the Cean, that found the art of memory, got the prize at Athens as teacher of a chorus, when Adimantus was Archon.*[m]

3. Olymp. LXXVII. 4. *Simonides the Poet died, being* 90 *years old, when Theagenides was Archon.*[n]

[h] Vide Od. II. Olymp. and III. Nem. and II. Isth.

[i] Pind. II. Isth. Callimachus apud Scholiast. Athenæus, p. 656. [=V. 389. *ed. Schw.*—D.] Synes. Ep. 49. Suid. v. Σιμων.

[j] Herod. v. 102. [k] Herod. ibid.

[l] Σιμωνίδης ὁ Σιμωνίδου πάππος τοῦ ποιητοῦ, ποιητὴς ὢν καὶ . . . . νησι, καὶ Δαρείου τελευτῇ.

[m] Σιμωνίδης ὁ Λεωπρεποῦς, ὁ Κεῖος, ὁ τὸ μνημονικὸν εὑρὼν, ἐνίκησεν Ἀθήνησιν διδάσκων, ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησιν . . . . . μάντου.

[n] Σιμωνίδης ὁ ποιητὴς ἐτελεύτησεν βιοὺς ἔτη ἐνενήκοντα, ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησιν Θεα . . . . νίδου.

The learned editors of the *Marmora*[o] have committed some mistakes in the explication of these three periods; but I think I have met with something that will set the whole matter right.

The person in the second period was our Simonides the Lyric, who made an epigram upon his own victory; this very victory here mentioned, when Adimantus was Archon: 'tis extant in the Scholiast on Hermogenes.[p]

Ἦρχε μὲν Ἀδείμαντος Ἀθηναίοις, ὅτ' ἐνίκα
Ἀντιοχὶς φυλὴ δαιδαλέον τρίποδα·
Ξεινοφίλου δέ τις υἱὸς Ἀριστείδης ἐχορήγει
Πεντήκοντ' ἀνδρῶν καλὰ μαθόντι χορῷ.
Ἀμφὶ διδασκαλίῃ δὲ Σιμωνίδῃ ἕσπετο κῦδος
Ὀγδωκονταέτει παιδὶ Λεωπρεπέος.[q]

The substance of it is this: *That, in the year when Adimantus was Archon at Athens, the chorus of the tribe Antiochis got the prize, Aristides being the furnisher of it, and Simonides the son of Leoprepes the teacher, who was then* 80 *years old.* 'Tis as plain, I think, as the sun at noon-day, that the Marble and the epigram speak of the same victory. And we have it here from Simonides's own mouth, that the 80th year of his age falls in with Olymp. LXXV. 3. in Adimantus's government. And of this same victory and epigram, the words of Valerius Maximus are to be understood: *Simonides,* says he, HIMSELF *glories, that he was teacher of a chorus in the* LXXXth *year of his age.*[r] And for those other

[o] Vid. notas Seldeni et Lydiati.

[p] P. 410.

[q] A part of it is produced by Plutarch (An Seni, &c.): *Εἴ γε Σιμωνίδης μὲν ἐν γήρᾳ χοροῖς ἐνίκα, καὶ τοὐπίγραμμα δηλοῖ τοῖς τελευταίοις ἔπεσιν,*

Ἀμφὶ διδασκαλίῃ δὲ Σιμωνίδῃ ἕσπετο κῦδος
Ὀγδωκονταέτῃ παιδὶ Λεωπρεπέος. [*Adden.*]

[*Ἦρχεν Ἀδείμαντος μὲν. Gaisford, P. M. G.* i. 377: and so Dobree conjectures, *Advers.* ii. 366.—D.]

[r] Val. Max. viii. 7. Simonides poeta octogesimo anno et docuisse se carmina et in eorum certamen descendisse ipse gloriatur.

words of the Marble, *ὁ τὸ μνημονικὸν εὑρὼν, who invented the art of memory*, Simonides himself is the best commentator. For in this very year he made an epigram in commendation of his memory:[s]

Μνήμῃ δ' οὔ τινα φημὶ Σιμωνίδῃ ἰσοφαρίζειν
Ὀγδωκονταέτει παιδὶ Λεωπρεπέος.

Nobody, says he, *has a memory like to Simonides, who am* 80 *years of age, the son of Leoprepes.*

And now that we have established this point, 'tis an easy matter to explain the third period in the Marble; which belongs to the same Simonides. For he was 80 years old Olymp. LXXV. 3.; and, says the Marble, Olymp. LXXVII. 4. *Simonides died at* 90. Now the interval between those two Olympiads is IX. complete years, and inclusively X. And with this the testimonies of Suidas[t] and Aristophanes's Scholiast exactly agree. *Simonides*, say they, *lived* 89 *years, and died Olymp.* LXXVIII. They were 89 complete years, and he had just entered upon the 90th.[u] And what the Marble puts at Olymp. LXXVII. 4., Suidas, with Diodorus and others, puts at LXXVIII. 1. For the Archontes in the Marble are all along one year before the accounts of other chronologers.

And then the first period in the Marble will have little of difficulty, since both the others are settled. The Simonides there mentioned was grandfather to him that we have been speaking of. The pedigree lies thus:

Simonides.
Leoprepes.
Simonides.

'Tis a known thing, that among the ancient Greeks the

[s] Arist. Orat. tom. iii. p. 645. [*Gaisford, P. M. G.* i. 377. *Μνήμην.*—D.]

[t] Suid. v. *Σιμων.* Schol. Aristoph. Vesp. p. 362. [= *Schol. to ed. Bekk.* p. 180.—D.]

[u] Lucian says, above 90. *ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐνενήκοντα.* in Macrob.

name of the grandfather was commonly given to the nephew, according to that of the poet,[v]

Ἱππόνικος Καλλίου, καὶ ἐξ Ἱππονίκου Καλλίας.

Now suppose this Simonides was no more than XL. years old when his nephew was born; at this Olympiad in the Marble, LXXII. 4. he must be CIX. So that I would fill up the gap in the Inscription thus; *ποιητὴς ὢν καὶ αὐτὸς τελευτᾷ Ἀθήνησιν, Simonides the Poet* DIED *at Athens.* For what else can he be mentioned here for, at that exceeding old age?

Now to sum up our argument about Stesichorus: If Simonides was LXXX. years old at Olymp. LXXV. 3., as we have proved beyond all contradiction; he must then have been LXXII. years of age at Olymp. LXXIII. 3., the year that Stesichorus took his voyage into Greece, according to the Marble. And this was the thing that I undertook to prove; and I conceive that the whole is a clear and convincing evidence, that Stesichorus's age was much earlier than the Marble has placed it.

But however, if any one will still be so obstinate as to prefer the sole authority of the Marble before all the other proofs that we have produced against it; he will take a most effectual and compendious way to ruin the credit of Phalaris's *Epistles*. For, in short, if the date of Stesichorus's age be true in the Marble, the *Epistles* are certainly false. For if Stesichorus was alive Olymp. LXXIII. 3., the pretended Phalaris was then in the throne; because he speaks of Stesichorus's death in several places.[w] But two whole years before that time, Olymp. LXXIII. 1., as Diodorus assures us,[x] there was another Tyrant of Agrigentum, Theron the son of Æneſidamus; and two years more before that, his brother Xenocrates, living in the same city,[y] won the victory

[v] Aristoph. Aves, p. 379. [=v. 283. ed. Bekk.—D.] [w] Ep. 15, 31, 33, 54. 103.
[x] Diod. p. 39. [y] Pindar. Schol. ad VI. Pyth. et II. Isth.

at the XXIV. Pythiad, which is coincident with Olymp. LXXII. 3. And if any body can think he put in at that prize with his chariot, while Phalaris was Tyrant, I wish him joy of his opinion.

The very learned Mr. Dodwell,[z] being sensible that Phalaris could not be alive LXXIII. 3., because Theron was then in the throne, sets both his and Stesichorus's death IV. years before that time, Olymp. LXXII. 3.; and so leaves Theron the space of two years to make his way to the crown, Olymp. LXXIII. 1. But it seems he was not aware of the Scholiast on Pindar,[a] who, from a good author, Hippostratus, himself too a good author, makes not Theron, but his great-grandfather Telemachus, to be one of Phalaris's deposers. Neither was Theron the next Tyrant of Agrigentum immediately after Phalaris, as Mr. D. here supposes; but first there was one Alcamenes,[b] and after him one Alcander who had a very prosperous reign. But besides this, why must Stesichorus die at Olymp. LXXII. 3.? Either let us follow the Marble, or let it alone. If we reject the authority of the Marble, Stesichorus must be supposed to die about Olymp. LVI., as the other authors affirm: if we adhere to it, then he lived till Olymp. LXXIII. 3., after Phalaris's death. And 'tis observable, that the Marble does not say, *he died* Olymp. LXXIII. 3.; but *ἀφίκετο εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα, he then went into Greece,* as Gorgias and other Sicilians did, to get money and fame. So that he might survive that period many years, according to the Marble; which is still a further confutation of Phalaris's *Epistles*. Yet Mr. D. first interprets the Marble, as if that was said to be the last year of Stesichorus's life; and then, for the sake of the *Epistles*, without any other author to warrant him, he cuts that life IV. years shorter.

[z] De Cyclis Vet. p. 261. [a] See above, p. 103.

[b] Heraclides Ponticus de Politiis. *Μετὰ τὸν Φάλαριν Ἀλκαμένης παρέλαβε τὰ πράγματα, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτον Ἄλκανδρος προέστη ἀνὴρ ἐπιεικής· καὶ εὐθένησαν οὕτως, ὡς περιπόρφυρα ἔχειν ἱμάτια.* [Ἀλκαμένης and εὐθένησαν are emendations of Bentley for Ἀλκμάνης and εὐσθένησαν. See Koeler's note on *Her. Pont. Fragm.* pp. 89, 90.—D.]

The second argument that Mr. Dodwell brings to establish his new opinion about Phalaris's age, may be summed up in this form:

"Pythagoras was at Agrigentum at the time of Phalaris's "death, and was the principal occasion of it. But Pythagoras "was never in Sicily till after the Pythagorean college at "Crotona was burnt by Cylon, which was Olymp. LXXII. 2. "Phalaris therefore was not dead before that Olympiad."

I am very sorry to differ from this learned man's judgment in a point of chronology, where he is so great a master. But, having examined the whole story of Pythagoras as carefully as I can, I am quite of another opinion in every part of this argument. For I think it more probable, that Pythagoras had no concern in the deposing of Phalaris; and that he was in Sicily before Cylon's conspiracy; and that the time of that conspiracy was before Olymp. LXXII.

The chief actor in deposing Phalaris was Telemachus, an ancestor of Theron's; as we have seen already in the Scholiast of Pindar. And the thing was done four generations before ever Pythagoras set foot in Sicily, in Mr. D.'s way of reckoning. Jamblichus is the first and only man that gives Pythagoras any share in that action. Laërtius and Porphyry, who have written the life of our philosopher, have not one word of it. And how could they omit such a singular thing, had they known it? or where could Jamblichus, that came after them, and did little else but pillage their writings, discover this new piece of history? 'Tis observable, that he cites no author for it; which he ought to have done if he could, because this was one of the greatest strokes in his whole narrative, and was a thing unsaid before. Porphyry indeed says, *When Pythagoras came to Italy and Sicily, he restored several cities there to their liberty; Crotona, Sybaris, Catana, Rhegium, Himera,* AGRIGENTUM, *Tauromenium, and others.*[c] And Lucian, whether in jest or earnest, makes Phalaris brag of Pythagoras's company.[d] These two pas-

[c] Porph. Vit. Pyth. p. 189. [d] Luc. in Phal. I.

sages, perhaps, were the sole foundation of Jamblichus's story. For if Pythagoras conversed with Phalaris, and delivered Agrigentum out of slavery; here was a fair occasion offered to Jamblichus, to put both ends together, and dress up his legend.

But, if we should allow Jamblichus's story for a truth, we need no other argument against Mr. D. but the very story itself, to prove the *Epistles* a cheat. For the *Epistles* make the tyrant and the philosopher to be very good friends, *and have five months' pleasant conversation together*;[e] and the tyrant talks of *Providence* like any Pythagorean, *While the governing Providence*, says he, *preserves the same system of the world*.[f] But Jamblichus's Phalaris is the very reverse of this. He is all fury and blasphemy, a rank atheist, he reviles and contemns the gods, he denies prophecy and providence; he contrives Pythagoras's death, and Pythagoras effects his.[g] How can these two stories hang together? If Jamblichus's account be true, the *Epistles* must be false. I must own, it's beyond my little understanding, to reconcile them; let others attempt it.

And again, this same story of Jamblichus plainly proves against Mr. D. that Pythagoras was in Sicily before Olymp. LXXII. 2. Jamblichus indeed says nothing about the time when Pythagoras deposed Phalaris: but since he brings in Abaris the Hyperborean in company with Pythagoras at the time of the action;[h] we are assured by that circumstance, that the date must be much earlier than Mr. D. has placed it. The time when Abaris came into Greece is very variously told; some put it at Olymp. III., others at XXI., others much lower;[i] which very diversity is a good argument that he came not so late as Mr. D. sets him, when chronology was pretty certain. But there is one authority beyond exception.

[e] Ep. 74. Πέμπτον ἤδε μῆνα συνεῖναι μεθ' ἡδονῆς.

[f] Ep. 104. Ἕως ἂν ἡ διοικοῦσα πρόνοια τὴν αὐτὴν ἁρμονίαν τοῦ κόσμου φυλάττῃ.

[g] Jambl. p. 184, 5, 6.

[h] Jambl. ibidem.

[i] Harpocrat. et Suidas, v. Ἄβαρις.

Pindar says, *He came in Crœsus's time;* who was conquered by Cyrus Olymp. LIX.[j] And with him Eusebius and Syncellus agree, both of them placing him about the reign of Crœsus. Now Pindar himself was XXX. years old at that very year, Olymp. LXXII. 2., when Mr. D. makes Abaris to have been in Greece.[k] But if Abaris had been truly there at that time, surely Pindar at XXX. years of age would have had better information, and not have cast him back to the reign of Crœsus, above 50 years before.

If we admit then of Jamblichus's narrative, we must place the time much higher than Mr. Dodwell has done. The only reason that Mr. D. has for it is this, *That Pythagoras did not go into Sicily till after Cylon's conspiracy.*[l] Which, with submission, I think is a very precarious assertion. 'Tis true, he did not leave Italy for good and all till that time; but what forbids us to suppose, he might make now and then a short voyage into Sicily? Why Justin says, *He came to Crotona, and continued there for twenty years.*[m] But this imports no more, than that generally and for the main he resided at Crotona; 'tis not to be so rigidly taken, as if he never had went out of town. For he was frequently at Metapontium, and Tarentum, and the neighbouring cities:[n] why may we not then as well suppose him to have stept into Sicily? Porphyry and Jamblichus talk of his journeys in Sicily,[o] long before they say a word of Cylon's conspiracy. Nay, we have the express testimonies of them both, that he was in Sicily before that time. For they say, *He was present the same day both at Tauromenium in Sicily, and Metapontium in Italy, at the meetings of his scholars.*[p] But 'tis agreed by all, that he had no society of scholars at Metapontium, or

[j] Harpoc. Ὁ δὲ Πίνδαρος κατὰ Κροῖσον τὸν Λυδῶν βασιλέα (φησὶν Ἄβαριν παραγενέσθαι).

[k] Pindar born Ol. LXV., forty years old at Xerxes's expedition, Ol. LXXV. 1. Suid.

[l] De Cyclis Vet. p. 26. [m] Justin. XX. 5. cùm annos XX. Crotonæ egisset.

[n] Livy, i. 18. Porphyr. p. 189. [o] Porph. 189. Jamb. 46.

[p] Porph. 192. Jamb. 128. Καὶ διειλέχθαι κοινῇ τοῖς ἑκατέρωθι ἑταίροις.

any where in Italy, after that villany of Cylon; almost all his followers being burnt or killed then, except Archippus and Lysis.

Neither can I assent to Mr. D.'s opinion, when he places that conspiracy of Cylon at Olymp. LXXII. 2. This has no express authority in history, nor any other foundation than Mr. Dodwell's calculations from some periods of Pythagoras's life. And since I differ from his opinion in stating those periods, in consequence I must dissent too about the time of Cylon's treachery. But, because this controversy cannot be well managed without giving a whole view of Pythagoras's life, I will here present the reader with a table of it, which shall comprehend the various accounts of the ancient chronologers, to which I shall subjoin some annotations, to shew the reasons and authorities for assigning every period. 'Tis a subject that deserves our nicest examination; and though I shall determine nothing myself, I may give an occasion to others of bringing it to a certainty.

OLYMPIADS.		YEARS OF PYTHAG.	
XLIII.	4.	1.	Pythagoras born.
XLVIII.	1.	18.	Won the prize at Olympia, Ol. XLVIII. 1. Eratosth., Phavor., Lucian, S. Augustin.
XLIX.	2.	23.	Pythagoras at man's age. Antilochus.
LIII.	3.	40.	Pyth. 40 years old, went to Italy. Aristoxenus.
	4.	41.	Pyth. in Italy after Ol. L. Dion. Halicarn.
LIV.	1.	42.	Pyth. famous Ol. LIV. 1. Chron. Alexand.
LVIII.	2.	59.	Pyth. went to Italy about 60 years old. Jamb.
LX.	1.	66.	Pyth. flourished Olymp. LX. Laërt.
LXI.	1.	70.	Pyth. famous Olymp. LXI. Diodorus.

OLYMPIADS.		YEARS OF PYTHAG.	
LXI.	4.	73.	Pyth. came to Italy in the reign of Superbus (*i. e.* from Olymp. LXI. 4. to LXVII. 4.) Cicero.
LXII.	1.	74.	Pyth. Ol. LXII. went to Italy. Jamblich.
	2.	75.	Pyth. famous Ol. LXII. Clemens, Cyril, Euseb., Tatian.
LXIII.	3.	80.	Pyth. died, 80 years old. Heraclides.
LXIV.	1.	82.	Pyth. taken captive by Cambyses in Egypt Olymp. LXIV. 1. Jambl., Syncellus.
LXVI.	1.	90.	Pyth. died at 90. Laërtius.
LXVII.	2.	95.	Pyth. died at 95. Syncellus.
LXVIII.	1.	98.	Pyth. went for Italy when Brutus was consul, *i. e.* Olymp. LXVIII. 1. Solinus. Pyth. in Italy when Brutus was consul. Cicero. Pyth. at Crotona when Sybaris was taken, Olymp. LXVIII. 1. Diod., Jambl.
	2.	99.	Pyth. died at 99. Tzetzes. Pyth. died near 100. Jamb.
	3.	100.	Pyth. died Olymp. LXVIII. 3. some MS. of Euseb., others LXVIII. 4.
	4.	101.	
LXIX.	3.	104.	Pyth. died at 104. Incertus, apud Photium.
LXX.	4.	109.	Pyth. died Olymp. LXX. 4. Eusebius vulgat.
LXXII.	4.	117.	Pyth. died, aged 117. Author De Med. par. fac.

I. The reason for assigning Pythagoras's birth to Olymp. XLIII. 4. is taken from the next period, his victory at the Olympian games Olymp. XLVIII.: for he was then ἐξέ-

φηβος, 17 years of age; his 18th year commencing with Olymp. XLVIII. Eratosthenes, a very great man, that wrote a chronology of the victors at Olympia, says, *Pythagoras Olymp.* XLVIII. *offered himself at the boys' match to fight at cuffs; but being voted by the judges to be above a boy's age, and laughed at as a coward for putting himself among boys, he presently offered himself at the match for men, and beat them every one.*[q] The Catalogue of the *Stadionicæ* says the very same thing, at Olymp. XLVIII.[r] So that there can be no mistake in the number: though Georgius Syncellus, who tells the same story, sets the time of it at Olymp. LI.[s] But his copy may have been corrupted, which could not possibly happen in the other case. The true reading of that passage of Syncellus I have given in the margin; and the meaning of it, which is much mistaken by his last editor, is no other than that of Eratosthenes before. Pausanias has a like account of one *Hyllus a Rhodian, that would have wrestled among the boys; but, being excluded by the judges because he was* 18 *years old, he presently wrestled with the men, and carried the victory.*[t] This Hyllus did the very same thing *πάλῃ at wrestling* that Pythagoras did *πυγμῇ at cuffing.* And from this last instance it appears, that the age of XVIII. was above the match for boys. The allowed time seems to be XVI., the year when they were called *Ephebi.*[u]

[q] Ἐρατοσθένης δέ φησι.... τοῦτον εἶναι τὸν πρῶτον ἐντέχνως πυκτεύσαντα, ἐπὶ τῆς ὀγδόης καὶ τετταρακοστῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος, κομήτην, καὶ ἀλευργίδα φοροῦντα· ἐκκριθῆναί [vulgò ἐκριφθῆναί. D.] τε ἐκ τῶν παίδων, καὶ χλευασθέντα, αὐτίκα προσβῆναι τοὺς ἄνδρας καὶ νικῆσαι. Laërt. in Pythag. [Forsan, προβῆναι εἰς τοὺς. *Dobree, Advers.* ii. 366.—D.]

[r] Πυθαγόρας Σάμιος ἐκκριθεὶς παίδων πυγμὴν, καὶ ὡς θῆλυς χλευαζόμενος, προβὰς εἰς τοὺς ἄνδρας ἅπαντας ἑξῆς ἐνίκησε. Apud Scaligeri Euseb. p. 40.

[s] Πυθαγόρας ὁ Σάμιος Ὀλύμπια ἀθλήσων, ἐξεκρίθη παίδων πυγμὴν (καὶ χλευασθεὶς), ὡς ἀπαλὸς, προβὰς εἰς τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐνίκα κατὰ τὴν ν α Ὀλυμπιάδα. Syncellus, p. 239. [where this passage is corrupt. Bentley has here corrected it.—D.]

[t] Paus. Eliac. ii. p. 191. Ὕλλος ὁ Ῥόδιος ὄγδοον ἐπὶ τοῖς δέκα ἔτεσι γεγονὼς, μὴ παλαῖσαι μὲν ἐν παισὶν ὑπὸ Ἠλείων ἀπηλάθη, ἀνηγορεύθη δέ ἐν ἀνδράσιν, ὅσπερ γε καὶ ἐνίκησε. [Instead of Ὕλλος Bekker gives Νικασύλος, p. 381. The concluding word of this quotation in all former editions of Bentley's Dissertation is printed by mistake ἐνικήθη.—D.]

[u] In the account of the *Ephebi* I followed Censorinus and Didymus. But

But 'tis not agreed among the ancients, that this Pythagoras was he that afterwards was the philosopher. Hesychius says, *They mistake that say so.*[v] And an epigram calls this Pythagoras the son of Crates;[w] but the other's father was Mnesarchus. Yet Eratosthenes, a very accurate author, believed he was the same. And so probably did Phavorinus, another great man, who cited Eratosthenes.[x] Lucian too was of this opinion,[y] and St. Austin.[z] And the epigram that Theætetus made upon this Pythagoras exactly fits the philosopher,

Πυθαγόρην τινὰ, Πυθαγόρην, ὦ ξεῖνε, κομήτην, &c.*

For the philosopher *wore his hair long*, which is the meaning of *κομήτης*. So that even Jamblichus, who applies the proverb, *ἐν Σάμῳ κομήτης*,[a] to Pythagoras the philosopher, may be added as another authority for settling this period; though it be against his own computations.

others, in Harpocration (v. Ἐπιδιετὲς and Ἐπώνυμοι), make the Ἔφηβοι begin at XVIII. years of age, and continue so to XX., and then they were called Ἄνδρες. Before the XVIII. year they were Παῖδες. And this account agrees better with the story of Pythagoras's fighting at Παίδων πυγμή. He, and Hyllus the Rhodian mentioned by Pausanias, offered themselves to fight with the *boys;* but being complete XVIII. years old, they were excluded; because they were no longer Παῖδες, but Ἔφηβοι. Vexed at this disappointment, they offered themselves to contend at the match for *men*, though they wanted two years of man's age: and, being admitted, they carried the victory from them all. This is that which made Pythagoras's victory at Olympia so memorable. [*Adden.*]

[v] Hesych. *ἐν Σάμῳ κομήτης.* [w] Laërt. in Pythag.

[x] *Ἐρατοσθένης φησὶ, καθὸ καὶ Φαβωρῖνος ἐν τῇ ὀγδόῃ παντοδαπῆς Ἱστορίας παραπλήσεται.* Laërt. in Pythag.

[y] Luc. in Gallo. *Ἀθλητῇ ποτε γενομένῳ, καὶ Ὀλύμπια οὐκ ἀφανῶς ἀγωνισαμένῳ.*

[z] Augustin. tom. ii. ep. 3. Pherecydes — Pythagoram Samium — ex athletâ in philosophum vertit.

[*

Εἰς Πυθαγόραν τὸν πύκταν.

Πυθαγόρην τινὰ, Πυθαγόρην, ὦ ξεῖνε, κομήτην,
ᾠδόμενον πύκτην εἰ κατέχεις Σάμιον,
Πυθαγόρης ἐγώ εἰμι· τὰ δ' ἔργα μου εἴ τιν' ἔροιο
Ἠλείων, φήσεις αὐτὸν ἄπιστα λέγειν.

Anth. Gr. ex rec. Br. (*ed. Jacobs.*), ii. 229. *Anth. Gr. ad fidem Cod. Pal. &c.* ii. 767.—D.]

[a] Jambl. p. 31. and 44.

But perhaps it may be thought improbable, that a man, that was bred up to fighting, should turn himself to the study of philosophy. For it was a common observation, that the gamesters at those exercises were very stupid and thick-skulled fellows.[b] But, however, there are several examples, that may warrant this story of Pythagoras. Cleanthes the Stoic philosopher, when he was young, was *a fighter at cuffs*,[c] πύκτης, just as Pythagoras was. And his scholar Chrysippus, the acutest of all the Stoics, was at first a *racer*.[d] Even Plato himself was *a wrestler*,[e] παλαιστὴς, at the Isthmian and Pythian games. And so was Lycon of Troas, a Peripatetic, at the Ilian. *Διὰ ταῦτα δέ*, says Laërtius, *καὶ παλαῖσαι λέγεται τά τε ἐν τῇ πατρίδι Ἴλεια, καὶ σφαιρίσαι.*[f] Where, instead of Ἴλεια, I would rather read it Ἰλίεια; that is, the *Ilian* games, from *Ilium*; as Ἐφεσήϊα from *Ephesus*.[g] So Athenæus, lib. viii. *Πυνθανόμενος δὲ (Στρατόνικος ὁ κιθαρῳδὸς τὸν σοφιστὴν Σάτυρον) ἐπιδημεῖν ἐν τοῖς Ἰλιείοις, Ἀεὶ, ἔφησεν, Ἰλίῳ κακά.*[h] There is nothing then so very unlikely in this story of Pythagoras. And the description they have given us of his person makes the account the more probable; for he was a lusty, proper man,[i] and built as it were to make a good boxer. Besides that they add, that this young Pythagoras was the first that boxed ἐντέχνως, *according to art:* which shews a promising genius, and agrees with the character of the philosopher; who, as Phavorinus and Porphyry say, so instructed one Eurymenes in his exercises, that he won the prize at Olympia.[j]

[b] Οἱ ἀθληταὶ ἀναίσθητοι.

[c] Laërt. in Cleanthe, et Suidas.

[d] Laërt. in Chrysippo, δολιχὸν ἤσκει.

[e] Laërt. in Platone, Apuleius, Cyrillus.

[f] Laërt. in Lycone. [I. 303. *ed. Meib.*, which has Διὰ τοῦτο, κ.τ.λ.—D.]

[g] See Marmora Arundel.

[h] P. 350. [= III. 293. *ed. Schw.*, where the reading is ἐν Ἰλίῳ ἐπιδημεῖν αὐτὸν. The words in our text between ( ) are introduced by Bentley as explanatory.—D.]

[i] Porph. p. 188. Τήν τε γὰρ ἰδέαν ἐλευθέριον καὶ μέγαν.

[j] Laërt. in Pythag. Porph. p. 186.

II. The next period in the table is Olymp. XLIX. 2., from which an ancient writer, Antilochus, or rather Antiochus, dates Pythagoras's ἡλικία. They are the words of Clemens Alexandrinus; *Antilochus, that wrote the book called* Ἱστορες, *reckons* 312 *years from Pythagoras's* ἡλικία *to the death of Epicurus.*[k] Now it's agreed that Epicurus died Olymp. CXXVII. 2., when Pytharatus was Archon. Reckon therefore backwards 312 years, and the ἡλικία of Pythagoras falls upon Olymp. XLIX. 2. But what's the meaning of ἡλικία? The very learned Mr. Dodwell interprets it, *The nativity of Pythagoras;*[l] and, to accommodate the passage to his own calculations, for δώδεκα he reads δέοντος ἑνὸς, that is, 299 for 312. I am afraid the world will not allow us such a liberty in our corrections, as for δώδεκα to put δέοντος ἑνὸς, where but one letter is the same; and not one, if you write δώδεκα in numerals, ιβ'. But I suppose he will not insist on this emendation, if it appear that ἡλικία does not signify *nativity;* for then the emendation will not agree with his accounts, any more than the vulgar reading does.

Let us examine, then, what the word ἡλικία means in other passages of Clement. *The years,* says he, *from Moses to Solomon's* ἡλικία *are* 610.[m] The particulars of his account are these:

Moses's life	120 years.
Thence to David's accession to the throne,	450
David's reign	40
	610

[k] Strom. i. p. 133. Ἀντίλοχος, ὁ τοὺς Ἱστορας πραγματευσάμενος, ἀπὸ τῆς Πυθαγόρου ἡλικίας ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐπικούρου τελευτὴν, ... ἔτη φέρει τὰ πάντα τριακόσια δώδεκα.

[l] De Cyclis Vet. p. 147. Fieri tamen potest, ut scripserit Antilochus τριακοσία δέοντος ἑνός. Exinde Librarius, si primam literam duntaxat manifestam habuerit, facillimo errore δώδεκα reposuerit. Sic omnia rectissimè procedent.

[m] Strom. p. 140. edit. Commelini. Γίνονται ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως ἐπὶ τὴν Σολομῶντος ἡλικίαν . . . . ἔτη τὰ πάντα ἑξακόσια δέκα.

By which it evidently appears, that the ἡλικία of Solomon is not meant of his *nativity*, but of the beginning of his reign, when he was 23 years of age.[n]

In another place he says, *Esaiah, Hosea, and Micah, lived after the* ἡλικία *of Lycurgus.*[o] And he proves it in this manner:

From the destruction of Troy to the ἀκμὴ of Lycurgus[p]	290 years.
From Solomon, in whose reign Troy was taken, to the time of those prophets .	300

'Tis manifest here, that ἡλικία and ἀκμὴ are put as synonymous words, to signify the same thing; *youth*, or *middle age, the flower of one's age.*

Eratosthenes, says Clemens, *places the* ἡλικία *of Homer a hundred years after the taking of Troy.*[q] That in this place also ἡλικία means ἀκμὴ, we may understand several ways. *Crates*, says Tatian, Ὅμηρον ἠκμακέναι φησί, *says Homer* FLOURISHED *within* 80 *years after the taking of Troy; but Eratosthenes says, after* 100.[r] *Some*, says Plutarch, *affirm that Homer lived at the time of the Trojan war, and was an eye-witness of it; others, that he lived* 100 *years after it.*[s] The word is here γενέσθαι, not *born*, but *lived;* as FUIT is in Latin writers. For, if it signified *was born* at the time of that war, he could not have been an eye-witness of it; for it lasted but 10 years, and he had been a child when it ended.

Thus we see all along in Clement, ἡλικία is taken for

[n] See Petav. in Chron.

[o] Ib. p. 141. Λέγονται δὲ οὗτοι μετὰ τὴν Λυκούργου ἡλικίαν γεγονέναι.—— Ἠσαΐας δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ Σολομῶντος διακοσιοστῷ ἔτει· correct it τριακοσιοστῷ. [Instead of τοῦ Σολομῶντος, Clemens has τῆς Σολομῶντος βασιλείας.—D.]

[p] Τὴν ἀκμὴν Λυκούργου. Clem. ibid.

[q] Ib. p. 141. Ἐρατοσθένης μετὰ τὸ ἑκατοστὸν ἔτος τῆς Ἰλίου ἁλώσεως τὴν Ὁμήρου ἡλικίαν φέρει.

[r] Tatian. p. 288. ed. Gesneri.

[s] Plutarch. in V. Homeri, p. 44. Γενέσθαι δ' αὐτόν φασι τοῖς χρόνοις, οἱ μὲν κατὰ τὸν Τρωϊκὸν πόλεμον, οὗ καὶ αὐτόπτην γενέσθαι· οἱ δὲ μετὰ ἑκατὸν ἔτη τοῦ πολέμου.

the *flourishing age;* and so it is generally in other writers. Plutarch, in the Life of Homer, after he had spoken of his childhood, γενόμενος δὲ ἐν ἡλικίᾳ, *but when he was come at age,* says he, *and had already a reputation for poetry.*[t] I do not believe there is any example, that ἡλικία means *nativity.* When Clemens would express the time of one's birth, he does not say ἡλικία, but γένεσις. Ἀπὸ τῆς Μωϋσέως γενέσεως,[u] and εἰς ἐπίδειξιν τῆς τοῦ Σωτῆρος γενέσεως.[v] So that upon the whole there is no question, but the ἡλικία of Pythagoras, in the passage we are speaking of, means the *flower of his age.* In the table, it falls upon his XXIII. year; and this exactly agrees with Solomon's age when he began his reign; which Clemens, as above, calls his ἡλικία. But Pythagoras himself had a peculiar way of distinguishing the age of a man's life. He divided it into four twenties; *A boy twenty, a youth twenty, a man twenty, and an old man twenty.*[w] And Antilochus perhaps might have a respect to this doctrine, when he put his ἡλικία at Ol. XLIX. 2. For it's not improbable, that he took his measure from Ol. XLVIII. 1., when Pythagoras got the victory at Olympia. And if he supposed him to be but XVI. years old at that time, which was the legitimate age for boys' exercises; his account then proceeds exactly from the XXth year of Pythagoras. The reader, if he pleases, may follow this reckoning, and place the nativity of Pythagoras at Ol. XLIV. 2. But I rather chose in the table to set it a little higher, for the reasons given above.

III. The next portion of his life, according to his own distribution, from his XXth year to the XLth, was spent in study and travelling. While he was young, he was scholar to Thales, and Bias, and Pherecydes, and Epimenides, and

[t] Id. p. 42. So in Vitâ Lycurgi. And so Xenoph. ἐν ἡλικίᾳ γενόμενοι, come at age. So οἱ ἐν τῇ ἡλικίᾳ, young men, those arrived at the age of men. Thucyd., Æschines.

[u] P. 145. [v] P. 146.

[w] Laërt. in Pythag. Παῖς εἴκοσι ἔτεα, νεηνίσκος εἴκοσι, νεηνίας εἴκοσι, γέρων εἴκοσι.

Hermodamas.[x] Indeed, when he conversed with Epimenides, he must needs be very young; for Epimenides died *μετ' οὐ πολύ, not long after* Olymp. XLVI.,[y] when he had expiated Athens from the murder of Cylon. Suidas places that expiation at Olymp. XLIV.;[z] but 'tis probable *μδ'* may be a fault of the writer, instead of *με'* or *μζ'*. And that he died *not long* after it, Suidas seems to confirm; for he says, he was then *old, γηραιός*. Plato indeed makes him to have come to Athens Olymp. LXX. 1. But that great man did not tie himself in his discourses to exactness of time, as I shall shew at large hereafter. His words are, *Epimenides came to you* (to Athens) *ten years, πρὸ τῶν Περσικῶν, before the Persian affairs; and the Athenians being then afraid of an expedition from Persia, φοβουμένων τὸν Περσικὸν στόλον, he told them it would be ten years before they came, and then they should be beaten.*[a] He means the battle at Marathon, which was Olymp. LXXII. 3. 'Tis true Aldobrandinus makes Plato agree with Laërtius.[b] For he interprets him, of the Persian expedition into Lydia, when Cyrus took Sardes. But why should the Athenians *be afraid* of that into Lydia? Plato himself in another place declares his own meaning. *Ten years*, says he, *before the sea-fight at Salamis, came Datis, Περσικὸν στόλον ἄγων, with the Persian forces.*[c] As for our philosopher's other masters, Thales and Pherecydes, the first was born Ol. XXXV. 1., and died above 90 years old, Olymp. LVIII.[d] The latter is supposed to have

[x] Νέος ὢν ἀπεδήμησε. Laërt. Νεανίας γενόμενος. Porphyr. Ἔτι ἔφηβος ὤν. Κομιδῆ τι νέος ἔτι ὑπάρχων. Περὶ δικτωκαιδέκατον μάλιστα ἔτος γεγονώς. Jamb.

[y] Laërt. in Pherecyde. Eusebius edit. Pontaci. Some copies of Laërtius have Olymp. XLVII. And so has Eusebius of Scaliger's edition.

[z] Suid. v. Ἐπιμενίδης.

[a] Plato de Legibus, i.

[b] In notis ad Laërt. in Epimenide.

[c] De Legib. lib. iii.—So Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. vi. p. 268.) declares that the expedition was not upon the Lydians, but the Athenians. Τοῦ Κρητὸς Ἐπιμενίδου αἱ θυσίαι Ἀθηναίοις τὸν Περσικὸν πόλεμον εἰς δεκαετῆ ὑπερέθεντο χρόνον. He seems to have had this passage from Plato, whose words I have cited. [*Adden.*—Instead of δεκαετῆ, Clemens has τὸν ἴσον.—D.]

[d] Laërt. in Thalete.

died about Ol. LIX.: and being then 85 years of age,[e] he must have been born about Olymp. XXXVII. 4. So that Thales was in his XXXVth year, and Pherecydes in his XXVth, at the birth of Pythagoras.

IV. In the XLth year of his life, our philosopher went to Italy. *When he was* XL. *years old,* says Aristoxenus, *and was uneasy under Polycrates's tyranny, he made his voyage for Italy.*[f] This year of his life falls in with Olymp. LIII. 3. according to our table. But at what period Aristoxenus himself placed the birth of Pythagoras, we cannot be certain. There are some reasons, that make us doubt whether he set that period as high as Eratosthenes did, whom we follow in the table. And there are other considerations, that seem to make it probable that these two great persons were both of one opinion. I'll represent the case on both sides, and leave the determination to the judgment of the reader.

Dionysius Halicarnassensis, a very accurate writer, seems to countenance that epocha that is set in the table. *Pythagoras,* says he, *after the* L*th Olympiad, lived in Italy.*[g] If *after* the LTh, then the LIII. 3. may possibly be the very year that Dionysius meant. But the learned Hen. Valesius suspects the reading to be false;[h] and for L. he corrects LX.; because several writers, and especially ecclesiastical, have set his time about Ol. LX. and LXII. But the whole context in Dionysius reclaims against this emendation. The author's design is to prove Pythagoras's age to be very remote from Numa's. *Numa,* says he, *came to the crown Olymp.* XVI. 3. *How then could he be acquainted with Pythagoras, that flourished after the* L*th Olymp., four generations after him?*[i] The

[e] Lucian. in Macrob.

[f] Porphyr. p. 184. Γεγονότα δ' ἐτων τεσσαράκοντα, φησὶν ὁ Ἀριστόξενος, καὶ ὁρῶντα τὴν [τοῦ] Πολυκράτους τυραννίδα συντονωτέραν οὖσαν, &c.

[g] Dionys. Hal. lib. ii. p. 120. Ὁ μὲν (Νομᾶς) ἐπὶ τῆς ἑκκαιδεκάτης Ὀλ. μεσούσης (he says before, ἐνιαυτῷ τρίτῳ τῆς ις' Ὀλυμπ.) . . . . . τὴν βασίλειαν παρέλαβε. Πυθαγόρας δὲ μετὰ τὴν πεντηκοστὴν Ὀλυμπιάδα διέτριβεν [vulgò διέτριψεν. D.] ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ.

[h] Valesius not. ad Excerpta, p. 41.

[i] Dionys. ibid. Τῷ μετὰ τέσσαρας γενεὰς ἀκμάσαντι,—μετὰ τὴν ν' Ὀλυμπιάδα.

interval between these two Olympiads is 134 years. Now three generations, as I have shewed before, make 100 years: four therefore are 133 and ⅓, which wants but a small fraction of 134. 'Tis plain then, that our author meant Olymp. the LTH: for to Olymp. LX. there are above *five* generations from Numa; and his business was to make the distance as wide as he could. In Mr. Dodwell's account, who keeps Pythagoras out of Italy till Olymp. LXVII. 2., there are above *six* generations.

Another, that seems to favour Eratosthenes, is no less a writer than Livy. *Numa*, says he, *could not converse with Pythagoras, who lived in the utmost coast of Italy, above* 100 *years after him, in the reign of Servius Tullius.*[j] Now, from the death of Numa, Olymp. XXVII. 1., to the period we speak of, Olymp. LIII. 3., there are 105 years; which exactly suits with Livy's expression, *centum amplius, above a hundred.* But if Livy had been of Mr. Dodwell's opinion, he might have said, *above an hundred and sixty.* Besides that Servius Tullius was 23 years dead before Mr. D. allows Pythagoras to set foot in Italy.

Plutarch mentions the same mistake, that Numa was Pythagoras's scholar. But he adds, that *Numa, as they say, was elected king Olymp.* XVI. 3.; *and Pythagoras was long after Numa's time, even five generations.*[k] He seems to have taken this passage out of Dionysius Halicarn., whose words we have cited before. But whereas Dion. says *four* generations, Plutarch says *five.* The reason of this difference seems to be, that the latter allows but 30 years to a generation, as we may learn from another place.[l] Five generations then, according to Plutarch, make 150 years. But from Olymp. XVI. 3.

[j] Livius, i. 18. Auctorem doctrinæ ejus (Numæ) falsò Samium Pythagoram edunt; quem, Servio Tullio regnante Romæ, centum amplius post annos, in ultimâ Italiæ orâ .... juvenum .... cœtus habuisse constat.

[k] Plut. in Vitâ Numæ. *Οἱ δὲ Πυθαγόραν μὲν ὀψὲ γενέσθαι, καὶ τῶν Νουμᾶ χρόνων ὁμοῦ τι πέντε γενεαῖς ἀπολειπόμενον —— ἐπὶ τῆς ἑκκαιδεκάτης Ὀλυμπιάδος, [ἧς] ἔτει τρίτῳ, Νουμᾶς εἰς τὴν βασίλειαν κατέστη.*

[l] Plut. de Orac. Defectu, p. 415. *Ἔτη τριάκοντα ποιοῦσι τὴν γενεὰν κατ' Ἡράκλειτον.*

to our period, Ol. LIII. 3. are 148 years, as near the mark as can possibly be expected.

Within two years of the same period, the Alexandrine Chronicon says, *Pythagoras was famous, Olymp.* LIV. 1.[m] So that this writer's testimony, such as it is, concurs exactly with the others above.

But we must observe the words of Aristoxenus; *When Pythagoras*, says he, *was* 40 *years old, and saw the tyranny of Polycrates grow more violent*.[n] These last words, if they be not an addition of Porphyry's, make it dubious, whether Aristoxenus set the philosopher's birth as early as Eratosthenes. For by this account Polycrates must begin his tyranny about Ol. LIII. 3.; and 'tis agreed by all historians, that he held it till Ol. LXIV. 1. when Cambyses was in Egypt: which interval is 42 years, and may seem too long a time to be allowed for his government. But did not Amasis, his contemporary, reign 44 years, after he had usurped the government in Egypt, just as the other did in Samos? If we admit of the present calculation, they begun their reigns almost at the same time; and that perhaps might be some reason of their friendship, that is so spoken of in history. But Polyænus's relation of the tyranny of Polycrates will scarce allow of so early a beginning. For he says, *At the time of his usurpation, he borrowed soldiers of Lygdamis Tyrant of Naxos*.[o] Now Lygdamis got the government of Naxos by the assistance of Pisistratus, after his third return to Athens;[p] which could not be before Olymp. LIX. 1. But perhaps it may be answered, that Polyænus might call him *Tyrant of Naxos* by an anticipation; meaning that Lygdamis that was afterwards Tyrant there. For Lygdamis might assist Polycrates with soldiers, as he helped Pisistratus both with men and

[m] Ὀλυμπ. νδ, α'. Πυθαγόρας φυσικὸς φιλόσοφος ἐγνωρίζετο.

[n] Ὁρῶντα τὴν Πολυκράτους τυραννίδα συντονωτέραν οὖσαν.

[o] Polyænus, Strat. i. 23. Μεταπεμψάμενος παρὰ Λυγδάμιδος τοῦ Ναξίων τυράννου στρατιώτας.

[p] Herodotus, i. cap. 64.

money, before he got the government.[q] Jamblichus plainly confirms this account of Polycrates's long reign. For he says, his tyranny was *beginning* at the XVIIIth year of Pythagoras;[r] and he speaks of it, as still continuing after his LVIth year.[s] Now the LVI. of Pythagoras, as Jamblichus reckons it, falls in about Olymp. LXII. So that his XVIIIth year, when Polycrates's tyranny commenced, concurs with Olymp. LII. 3., which is just four years before Pythagoras left Samos, according to our table. And to Jamblichus we may add Suidas,[t] who places Polycrates's government about the same Olymp. LII.[u] But the same author in another place says, that *one Polycrates the father of the Tyrant governed Samos about Olymp.* LIV. *in Crœsus's time.*[v] This is a piece of history that I know not what to say to. For the father of Polycrates the Tyrant was called Æaces,[w] and Crœsus's reign did not begin till Olymp. LV. 3.

But though Aristoxenus say our philosopher went to Italy at XL. years of age, yet Jamblichus makes him about LX.; and whether of them must we follow? If we regard the authority of the two parties, I am afraid Jamblichus must be laid aside; for he is both inferior to the other, and inconsistent with himself. But let us consider the nature of the thing, and the circumstances of the story. Her-

[q] Herod. i. c. 61.

[r] Jamb. p. 31. Ὑποφυομένης δὲ ἄρτι τῆς Πολυκράτους τυραννίδος, περὶ ιη' μάλιστα ἔτος γεγονώς.

[s] Idem, p. 90.

[t] Suid. v. Ἀνακρέων. Γέγονε κατὰ Πολυκράτην τὸν Σάμου τύραννον Ὀλυμπιάδι νβ'.

[u] The famous Apollodorus seems to favour this early beginning of Polycrates's reign. (Laërt. in Anaximand.) For he says, Anaximander was LXIV. years old at Olymp. LVIII. 2.; *and died soon after, having flourished most in the time of Polycrates Tyrant of Samos;* καὶ μετ' ὀλίγον τελευτῆσαι, ἀκμάσαντά πη μάλιστα κατὰ Πολυκράτην τὸν Σάμου τύραννον. Now, if we place the first year of Polycrates at Olymp. LIII. 3., Anaximander at that time was in his XLVth year, which seems old enough in all reason to begin his ἀκμὴ at. [*Adden.*]

[v] Suid. v. Ἴβυκος. Εἰς Σάμον ἦλθεν, ὅτ' αὐτῆς ἦρχε Πολυκράτης, ὁ τοῦ τυράννου πατήρ· χρόνος δὲ οὗτος ὁ ἐπὶ Κροίσου, Ὀλυμπιὰς νδ'.

[w] See Herod.

mippus, a considerable author, tells us,[x] "That when Pytha-
" goras came to Italy, he made a private room under
" ground; and having caused a report to be spread of his
" death, he hid himself in that room, ordering his mother
" to let him down meat privately from time to time, with
" an account in writing of all affairs that happened in
" Crotona, and the places about. After a time he comes
" abroad,[y] pretending to be risen from the dead; and tells
" all the things that had happened since his supposed
" death, as if he had learnt them in the other world.
" Which project procured him a mighty authority." The same story is told us by Sophocles's Scholiast,[z] who thinks the poet himself alluded to it in these verses in his *Electra;*

> Ἤδη γὰρ εἶδον πολλάκις καὶ τοὺς σοφοὺς
> Λόγῳ μάτην θνήσκοντας· εἶθ', ὅταν δόμους
> Ἔλθωσιν αὖθις, ἐκτετίμηνται πλέον. [v. 62. *ed. Erf.*]

And Tertullian too, a man of admirable wit and learning, in his Book *about the Soul,* gives the same account of this story; and he adds this particular, that he staid under ground *seven years;*[a] which without question he speaks from some good authority; and the design itself, that Pythagoras had in it, seems to require so long a time. For the cheat might have been suspected, if he had soon appeared abroad again; neither would there have been matter of fact enough, as deaths, marriages, and births, and public transactions, the accounts of which he pretended to have learnt below from the ghosts of those that died after him. Now I suppose this design of Pythagoras will seem a very absurd one, if he was LX. years old when he went to Italy, as Jamblichus makes him. Besides that he must have lived no little time there,

[x] Apud Laërt. in Pythag.

[y] So Lucian in Gallo, p. 252. Ἥκουσα ταῦτα, καὶ ὡς δόξειας ἀναβεβιωκέναι ἀποθανών.

[z] Schol. ad Electram, p. 83. [= ii. 142. *ed. Erf.*—D.]

[a] Tertull. de Animâ, c. 28. Mortem simulat, subterraneo latitat, septenni se illic patientiâ damnat——cum fraude vitæ septennio excruciatæ infra terram.

so as to be generally known, before he undertook it; or else they would never have believed that he had rose from the dead, had they not known him alive before. He must be well advanced then beyond 60 when he began this design. But what could one of that great age propose to himself from so tedious a project?

*Vitæ summa brevis spem cùm vetat inchoare longam.**

He might die indeed in jest, when he went down to his vault; but he might fear 'twould be in good earnest before seven years were over. Or, if he was sure to come out alive again, yet the remainder of life after LXX. years of age, when he was to enjoy the fruits of this pious fraud, was not worth so long a penance. For he came out half starved, a mere skeleton, to make it the more credible to them that he rose from the grave.[b] But there's another circumstance that makes it still more unlikely that he was LX. years old then. For the only person privy to his design was his mother:[c] and was† she then at a fit age for the whole plot to depend upon? Suppose her to be but 20 when Pythagoras was born, though she had another son before him;[d] even at this rate she would be about fourscore and ten before the intrigue could be finished. This surely was too slender a thread to trust a business of that weight to. It is very probable therefore, if this story be true, that Pythagoras was but about XL. when he went into Italy. Nay, though the story should be false, it is still a very good argument; for it shews, at least, that all those that have reported it must have believed he was not much older.

[* Hor. *Od.* I. iv., where "*nos* vetat."—D.]

[b] Hermippus. Ἰσχνὸς καὶ κατεσκελετευμένος. Tertull. Corpulentiam interpolâsse visus ad omnem mortui veteris horrorem. [In Tertullian the passage stands; "ut satis sibi visus est corpulentiam interpolâsse ad omnem," &c. *Op.* p. 342. *ed.* 1566.—D.]

[c] Herm. Τῇ μητρὶ ἐνετείλατο. Tertull. Ab unicâ consciâ et ministrâ matre.

[† The old ed. "was *not* she:" but "*not*" seems to have crept into the text by a mistake of the compositor: it is omitted in the ed. of 1777. Lennep renders the passage "eane tum ætate esse?" &c. p. 187.—D.]

[d] Porph., Jamblich.

But we have another piece of history, which most writers agree in, that seems to make him much younger when he went for Italy than Jamblichus's account does. That is the *πενταετία, the five years' silence,*[e] that was enjoined to his disciples before they were admitted to his conversation; or, as some say, even to the sight of him. Now it appears, from the whole conduct of Pythagoras, that he aimed to be founder of a sect, and by the interest of his scholars to change the forms of several governments. But would any man of threescore years age, if he had such designs in his head, have taken such a slow method of bringing them about? He must surely be a younger man, and have the prospect of many years before him, when he began such a discipline. Or else he must needs apprehend, that old age and death would be at his heels before the ceremonious silence was over. This *quinquennium,* therefore, even alone, makes it very unlikely that he was LX. when he went for Italy; but if it be added to the story above, his *seven years' stay in the vault,* it will make that account of his age still the more improbable; for at that rate he was near LXX. years old when he began that tedious method.

Another confirmation of Aristoxenus's account, that Pythagoras was but XL. when he first came to Italy, is his marrying a wife at Crotona, Theano, the daughter of Brontinus, by whom he had two sons and two daughters.[f] About his love to Theano we have these elegant verses of Hermesianax, the Colophonian poet, that lived in Alexander's time:[g]

Οἴη μὲν Σάμιον μανίη κατέδησε Θεανοῦς
Πυθαγόρην, ἑλίκων κομψὰ γεωμετρίης
Εὑράμενον· καὶ κύκλον ὅσον περιβάλλεται αἰθὴρ,
Βαιῇ τ' ἐν σφαίρῃ πάντ' ἀποτασσόμενον.

Here we see, he had such a passion for his mistress Theano,

[e] Laërt., Porphyr., Jambl., &c.

[f] Laërt. in Pythag.

[g] Athen. xiii. p. 599. [= V. 166. *ed. Schw.*, who gives εὑρόμενον in the third, and omits τ' in the fourth line.—D.]

that the poet calls it *madness*. Which better agrees with the age of 50 than 70, after he had stayed 7 years in the vault. For that he had no wife till after that time, may be fairly gathered from this circumstance, that his old mother, and she only, was conscious to his plot. The names of his two sons are Telauges and Mnesarchus. The former is mentioned by Empedocles;[h] whose verse must be mended thus;

Τηλαυγὲς, κλυτὲ κοῦρε Θεανοῦς Πυθαγόρεώ τε.

And by Jamblichus, (*Τηλαυγὴς*) *κομιδῇ νέος ὑπὸ τὸν Πυθαγόρου θάνατον ὑπολελειμμένος ἦν περὶ θέαν οἱ τῇ μητρί.** Where the Latin version has it, *In spectaculo matris Deûm.* But for *περὶ θέαν οἱ τῇ μητρί*, it ought to be corrected, *παρὰ Θεανοῖ τῇ μητρί.* The other son in Jamblichus is called *Μνήμαρχος*, Mnemarchus; which perhaps is a reading not to be rejected. For Festus tells us,[i] Pythagoras had a son called Mamercus; which seems to be formed from the Doric pronunciation of the Greek word *Μνάμαρχος*.

V. Most of the ecclesiastical writers date the *ἀκμὴ*, *the flourishing age*, of Pythagoras at Olymp. LXII. Tatian[j] and Clement[k] are the first of them; and their very subject, which was to shew the Greek antiquity to be more recent than the Jewish, induced them to bring his time down as low as they could. No wonder then, that they rather followed those writers that placed him at Olymp. LX., than those others, which, as we have already seen, have put him something higher. Clement's computation is subscribed to, as in most other cases, by Cyril.[l] St. Austin says,[m] he began to be famous at the return of the Jewish captivity;

[h] Laërt. in Pythag. *Ἱππόβοτος φησὶ λέγειν Ἐμπεδοκλέα Τηλαυγεῖ, κλυτὲ κοῦρε Θεανοῦς Πυθαγόρεώ τε.*

[* *De Vitâ Pyth.* p. 123. *ed. Kust.*, where *ἀπολελειμμένος*.—D.]

[i] Festus, v. Æmil.

[j] Tatian. ad Græcos, pag. ult.

[k] Clem. i. Strom. p. 130 and 143.

[l] Cyril. contra Julian. p. 12.

[m] Aug. de Civitate Dei, xviii. 37.

that is, about Olymp. LXII. Eusebius indeed, according to Scaliger's edition, fixes his time at Olymp. LXV. 1. But some MS. copies of him, which I think are here in the right, set it at Ol. LXII. 3. or 4. But in all this there is no contradiction between those that say, he flourished Olymp. LXII., and those that say, about LII. For since he lived to be above ninety years old, we may truly say, he flourished at 40, 50, 60, nay 80 years of age.

But Cicero says[n] he *came* into Italy in the reign of Superbus; which could not be before Olymp. LXI. 4. And Jamblichus[o] dates his voyage thither at Olymp. LXII., when Eryxidas, or, as others call him, Eryxias[p] of Chalcis won the race at Olympia. These are plain and direct testimonies against the opinion of those above. And the judicious reader must consider which account is the more probable. Only let him remember, that the later he brings Pythagoras into Italy and Sicily, the more surely he detects the forgery of Phalaris's *Epistles*. But what if it may be suspected that Cicero and Jamblichus, or the authors they had it from, mistook out of forgetfulness? So as, when others had said, he *was* in Italy Olymp. LXII., these might say, he *came* thither. We have a near instance of an error exactly like this. Cicero had said, *That Pythagoras* WAS *in Italy at the same time that Brutus delivered his country;*[q] that is, Olymp. LXVIII. 1. This seems to have been the sole foundation of Solinus's new doctrine, *That Pythagoras* CAME *to Italy when Brutus was consul.*[r]

As for Jamblichus, he has so managed his accounts, that he has discovered how little he was versed in ancient chro-

[n] I. Tuscul. Pythagoras,.... qui cùm Superbo regnante in Italiam venisset.

[o] Παρεγένετο εἰς Ἰταλίαν κατὰ τὴν Ὀλυμπ. ξβ', καθ' ἣν Ἐρυξίδας ὁ Χαλκιδεὺς στάδιον ἐνίκησεν. Jambl. p. 47.

[p] Catalog. Stadion. in Euseb. Scaligeri.

[q] Tuscul. iv. Pythagoras, qui fuit in Italiâ temporibus iisdem, quibus L. Brutus patriam liberavit.

[r] Solinus, c. xxi. Pythagoras, Bruto consule, qui reges urbe ejecit, Italiam advectus est.

nology. "Pythagoras," he says, "went into Egypt, and "continued there XXII. years,[s] till he was carried by Cam-"byses to Babylon, where he stayed XII. years;[t] and from "thence, being about 56 years old, he returned to Samos;[u] "where not finding things to his desire, he left it, and went "to Italy, Olymp. LXII., when Eryxidas got the prize."[v] Here's a story so well told, that it contradicts itself in the reckoning, no less than XX. years. For it was VIII. years after Olymp. LXII. when Cambyses was in Egypt; and XII. more, he says, were spent at Babylon. Who would depend upon such a computation, or indeed upon any part of it, when the whole is so inconsistent? Yet the learned Mr. Dodwell has assumed that 12 years' stay at Babylon, that has nothing to vouch it but this lame and self-confuted story, for the basis of all his calculations in Pythagoras's life: though at the same time he makes very bold with the other parts of the story; for he differs from the date at Eryxidas's victory no less than five whole Olympiads; and instead of XXII. years in Egypt, he allows something *above one;*[w] though Plutarch says, it's confessed he was there *long time;*[x] and *no little time,* says Cyrillus.[y]

Syncellus indeed agrees with Jamblichus in his narrative of Cambyses. For he also says, that Pythagoras was found by him in Egypt, and carried away prisoner.[z] But Apuleius tells the story quite another way: for he says, Pythagoras was carried TO, and not FROM Egypt, among the captives of Cambyses.[a] And he seems to refer to that stratagem of

[s] Jambl. p. 36. [t] P. 37. [u] P. 37. [v] P. 47.

[w] De Cycl. Vet. p. 138. Spatio plusquam annuo.

[x] Plut. Symp. Quæst. viii. 8. *Αἰγυπτίων τοῖς σοφοῖς συγγενέσθαι* (Πυθαγόραν) *πολὺν χρόνον ὁμολογεῖται.*

[y] Cyrillus contra Jul. p. 15. *Πυθαγόρας καὶ Θαλῆς οὐκ εὐαρίθμητον ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ διατετριφότες καιρόν.*

[z] Syncell. *Πυθαγόραν εὑρὼν ἐπιξενωθέντα διὰ φιλοσοφίαν σὺν τοῖς αἰχμαλώτοις εἰς Πέρσας ἦγε.* [Instead of *ἦγε*, Syncellus has *τελεῖ*.—D.]

[a] Apuleius Florid. ii. Sunt qui Pythagoram aiant, eo temporis inter captivos Cambysæ regis Ægyptum cùm adveheretur, doctores habuisse Persarum Magos; ..... posteaque eum à quodam Gillo Crotoniensium principe reciperatum.

Polycrates,[b] when, under pretence of sending forces to the aid of Cambyses, he selected all the men he was jealous of; with private directions to the king, that he should let none of them return home. Apuleius therefore adds, in contradiction to this, *That the more general report was, that Pythagoras went voluntarily into Egypt*;[c] that is, he was not pressed by Polycrates into the Persian service. This, as I take it, is the true meaning of Apuleius; and the reader may consider what credit a story deserves, that is told such different ways. But what will he say to the other piece of secret history, *that one Gillus, a prince of Crotona, redeemed Pythagoras out of captivity?* Some take this Gillus to be the same with Cylon of Crotona: but he is Gillus of Tarentum,[d] who, living in exile at Crotona, redeemed some Persian slaves there, and carried them into Persia to Darius, about Ol. LXV. 1. Here we see how the story is turned. Gillus really redeemed slaves at Crotona, and carried them to Persia; but Apuleius makes him redeem one in Persia, and carry him to Crotona. I know it's easy to be said, that he might do both: but he had another errand to Persia than buying of slaves, as may be seen in Herodotus.

VI. We come now to the several periods of Pythagoras's death. The most early that we meet with (for perhaps *οε*, 75, in Syncellus, is an error for *ρε*, 105) is thus delivered by Laërtius: *Pythagoras*, says he, *as Heraclides the son of Serapion says, died* LXXX. *years old, κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ὑπογραφὴν τῶν ἡλικιῶν, according to his own distribution of ages.*[e] This Heraclides had epitomised Sotion's work *about the Successions of the Philosophers*, and another work of Satyrus's *about the Lives of famous Men.* In one of these two treatises he is supposed to have said this that Laërtius cites from

[b] Herod. lib. iii. cap. 44.

[c] Ibid. Celebrior fama obtinet, sponte eum petisse Ægyptias disciplinas.

[d] Herod. iii. c. 138.

[e] Laërt. in Pythag. Πυθαγόρας, ὡς μὲν Ἡρακλείδης φησὶν ὁ τοῦ Σαραπίωνος, ὀγδοηκοντούτης ἐτελεύτα, κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ὑπογραφὴν τῶν ἡλικιῶν.

him. Upon which the very learned Mr. D. observes, that this was not Sotion's nor Satyrus's opinion, but the private one of Heraclides; because it was *according to his own description of ages.*[f] And from thence he makes a conjecture, what Sotion's account might be; and believes it to be a *wonderful confirmation*[g] of what he had delivered. But I am sorry this learned person should so widely mistake the sense of his author; who does not mean Heraclides's *own distribution of ages,* but Pythagoras's own. For Pythagoras, as the same Laërtius relates,[h] divided the whole life of man into four ages, ἡλικίαι; to each of which he assigned the space of XX. years: so that the complete life of a man was according to him LXXX. years. Pythagoras therefore, says Heraclides, died LXXX. years old, after his own description of ages, *κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ὑπογραφὴν τῶν ἡλικιῶν.*[i]

But to determine the year of Pythagoras's death, we must endeavour in the first place to discover the time of Cylon's conspiracy; for they all say, that he either lost his life at that time, or survived but a few months after. It could not happen before Olympiad LXVII. 4. if Diodorus[j] and Jamblichus[k] may be believed, who affirm, that Pythagoras was then alive, and in Italy, when the Crotonians went to war with the Sybarites. For that war, by Diodorus's computation, was about that Olympiad. And Cicero also concurs with them; for he says, *Pythagoras was in Italy when Brutus delivered his country:*[l] which happened at the very same time, Olymp. LXVII. 4. But that Cylon's villany was committed presently after that war, it appears from Jamblichus, or rather Apollonius, whom he cites for

[f] De Cyclis Vet. p. 144, 145.

[g] Ibid. Faciunt hæc mirificè ad ea confirmanda, quæ hactenùs observavimus.

[h] Laërt. in Pythag. sect. 10.

[i] Censorinus (cap. xv.) says the very same thing about Plato, that he died at LXXXI., which he counted the legitimate extent of human life. Annum octogesimum et unum,.... in quo Plato finem vitæ et legitimum esse existimavit, et habuit. [*Adden.*]

[j] Diodor. Sic. p. 77.

[k] Jambl. p. 125, 157.

[l] Cic. Tuscul. Quæst. iv.

it. *After the Crotonians had destroyed Sybaris,* says he, *then Cylon's faction put their malice in execution.*[m] And in Cylon's invective against the Pythagoreans, when he incensed the government against them, there is this expression, *That it was a shame, that they who had conquered* 300,000 *men at the river Traïs, should now be enslaved at home by the* 1000*th part of that number.*[n] By the 1000th part he understands the disciples of Pythagoras, that were in all about 300.[o] And by the victory at Traïs, he means the battle with the Sybarites,[p] who brought into the field 300,000 men. *Τράεντα* I read in Jamblichus for *Τετράεντα*; for I find in Diodorus[q] that Traïs is a river near Sybaris. These passages of Jamblichus will, I suppose, be allowed to prove, that the conspiracy of Cylon must be dated very soon after the destruction of Sybaris, which was Ol. LXVII. 4. Let it be put then about two years after it, Olymp. LXVIII. 2.; and it concurs with the 99th year of Pythagoras, according to Eratosthenes, and the calculation in our table. All which tends to make it still more probable that the computation is true. For at that very year of his age Pythagoras died, as the generality of authors say. *He died,* says Tzetzes, *a hundred years old, wanting only one.*[r] *Near a hundred,*[s] says Jamblichus. Laërtius indeed says, *at ninety;*[t] but Casaubon and Menagius, and other judicious critics, think the author wrote it *ninety-nine;* his

[m] Jambl. p. 212. Ἐπεὶ δὲ Σύβαριν ἐχειρώσαντο, ... ἐξερράγη τὸ σιωπούμενον μῖσος.

[n] Jambl. p. 217. Αἰσχρὸν εἶναι . . . . τοὺς τριάκοντα μυριάδων περὶ τὸν Τετράεντα ποταμὸν περιγενομένους, ὑπὸ τοῦ χιλιοστοῦ μέρους ἐκείνων ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ πόλει φανῆναι κατεστασιασμένους.

[o] Jamb. p. 212. Justin. xx. 4. Athenagoras.

[p] Diod. Siculus, p. 76 and 77. Στρατευσάντων . . . . τῶν Συβαριτῶν τριάκοντα μυριάσιν. Strabo, vi. Τριάκοντα μυριάσιν ἀνδρῶν ἐπὶ Κροτωνιάταις ἐστράτευσαν.

[q] Diod. p. 85. Διαφεύγοντες τὸν ἐν τῇ στάσει κίνδυνον Συβαρῖται περὶ τὸν Τράεντα ποταμὸν κατῴκησαν.

[r] Tzetzes, p. 205. Ἐτῶν ὑπάρχων ἑκατὸν πλὴν ἕνος ἑνὸς μόνου.

[s] Jamb. p. 220. Βιώσαντα ἔτη ἐγγιστῶν ἑκατόν. Read with Mr. D. ἔγγιστα τῶν ἑκατόν· or rather ἐγγὺς τῶν, for the MS. had it ἐγγυστῶν.

[t] Laërt. in Pyth. Ὡς δὲ [οἱ] πλείους, ἔτη βιοὺς ἐννενήκοντα· they read ἐννενήκοντα ἐννέα.

copies being now corrupted. And some MSS. of Eusebius place his death at the very next year, Olymp. LXVIII. 3.[u]

This last passage of Jamblichus, where he intimates that Cylon's conspiracy came quickly after the Sybaritic war, being not only corrupted in the original, but most miserably handled in the Latin translation, it cannot be imputed as a fault to the learned Mr. Dodwell, that he did not take direction from it when he made his computations. He has dated that conspiracy at Olymp. LXXII. 3.; which is almost XX. years after the war with the Sybarites. But his reckoning proceeds upon two suppositions, that perhaps will hardly be granted him. First, he assumes that Pythagoras stayed a dozen years at Babylon, after Cambyses's expedition into Egypt. But this, I presume, will now appear to be a false account, by the authorities I have produced above. Then he adds, that Pythagoras continued just XX. years at Crotona in Italy; and since according to his calculation he came thither at Olymp. LXVII. 2., he must consequently be driven out of it at Olymp. LXXII. 3. But the only voucher for that XX. years' stay at Crotona is a passage in Justin, which we have cited already.[v] And that seems to be spoken roundly and in the gross, without taking notice of odd years. But Jamblichus says, he continued there 39 years; and perhaps it may be suspected, that the true reading in Justin is XL., and not XX.; for the copies are not much to be trusted, when there is nothing but bare figures, without circumstances to specify the time.

'Tis true, Jamblichus does not say expressly, that Pythagoras stayed in Italy 39 years, but only that *he presided over the Pythagorean School*[w] so long. Mr. D. therefore, comparing these two passages of Jamblichus and Justin together, has inferred from them both, that Pythagoras lived XIX. whole years after the conspiracy of Cylon. This is a history entirely new and his own; and I am sorry it has no

[u] Euseb. edit. Pontac.

[v] P. 116.

[w] Jamb. p. 220. *Αὐτὸν μὲν γὰρ Πυθαγόραν ἀφηγήσασθαι λέγεται ἐνὸς δέοντος ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα.*

better foundation than two figures (xx.) in Justin, and those also misapplied to a place of Jamblichus. For I think nothing can be plainer, than that Jamblichus understood the whole 39 years to have been spent before the treachery of Cylon. For when he first enters upon his narrative about Cylon, he tells us of Pythagoras's death at Metapontium:[x] and after he has finished it, his very next words are an account of Pythagoras's successors.[y] Several writers have affirmed, that Pythagoras himself was burnt at the same time with his scholars.[z] And the rest, that disagree with these, make him die presently after. And some tell us the several steps of his escape; that first he fled to Locri,[a] thence to Tarentum, and thence to Metapontium, where he took sanctuary in the Temple of the Muses, and was starved there after 40 days' fasting. All this they describe, as done without any stop or stay; so as the Locrians met him at the very confines, and would not let him set foot upon their territory. Others therefore take no notice of his going to Locri and Tarentum; but carry him immediately and directly from Crotona to Metapontium, where he ended his days.[b] Thus, we see, the whole stream of historians runs against Mr. Dodwell.

But the same very learned person has proceeded yet further, and has told us the place where Pythagoras lived for those xix. years after the sedition of Cylon: even in Sicily, where he deposed Phalaris, and rescued Himera, and Catana, and other cities, from the yoke of tyranny. The only fund for this conjecture is Hermippus's relation of Pythagoras's death; which differs from all the rest. He says, *When the Agrigentines were at war with the Syracusians, Pythagoras went with some of his scholars, and*

[x] P. 208. [y] P. 219.

[z] Quidam apud Laërt. Suidas. Plutarch. de repugn. Stoicorum, p. 1051, et de Socratis Genio, p. 583. Arnob. lib. i. Athenagoras. Valer. Max. viii. 7. Firmicus, Astron. i. 3. Tzetzes, Chil. xi. 366.

[a] Porph. de Vitâ Pyth. 206. Themistius, Orat. iv. Firmicus, ibid.

[b] Dicæarchus apud Laërt. Justin. xx. 4. Jamblichus, 208.

headed the Agrigentines; but his party was routed and himself slain, being overtaken in his flight, because he would not go through a field of beans.[c] Now what is there in these words, that shews Pythagoras to have lived in Sicily before? Why might he not go from Crotona to the assistance of the Agrigentines? Is there any thing more common in history, than to have the Sicilians and the inhabitants of Magna Græcia engaged with one another? But allowing he was fixed in Sicily before, yet here's nothing determined about the time of this war: why may we not then suppose it was about the time of Cylon's sedition, rather than, as Mr. D. sets it, XIX. years after? Hermippus's own words seem to favour us in it; for he adds, *That the rest of his scholars, being* XXXV. *in number* (all but those that were slain in the fight with the Syracusians) *were burnt at Tarentum for disturbing the government.*[d] Now this burning at Tarentum appears to be the same that was contrived by the Cylonian faction, presently after the sedition at Crotona.[e] But Mr. D. thinks Pythagoras was slain in that war that Thrasydæus Tyrant of Agrigentum made upon Hiero of Syracuse, Olymp. LXXVII. 1.[f] Which is to add another improbability to all that have gone before. For who will believe, that Pythagoras would side with Thrasydæus, a tyrannical and profligate man, in a groundless and unjust war,[g] against Hiero, who was the bravest prince of his time, and a great patron of learning; some of the greatest wits of that age residing at his court, Simonides, Pindar, Bacchylides, Æschylus, and (which is still a further argument) Pythagoras's own scholar, Epicharmus?

But Mr. Dodwell fetches two new arguments, from the successions of the Pythagorean School, to confirm his asser-

[c] Laërt. Ἐξελθεῖν μετὰ τῶν συνήθων τὸν Πυθαγόραν, καὶ προστῆναι τῶν Ἀκραγαντίνων.

[d] Laërt. ibid. Ἐν Τάραντι κατακαυθῆναι.

[e] Porphyr. p. 207. Εἰς Τάραντα πλεῦσαι, πάλιν δὲ κἀκεῖ παραπλήσια παθόντα τοῖς περὶ Κρότωνα. See Jamb. p. 218.

[f] Diodor. Sic. p. 40.

[g] Diodor. ibid.

tion about the age of Pythagoras.[h] "For Lysis, one of the "scholars of Pythagoras, was preceptor to Epaminondas and "Philip of Macedon, both of whom lived after Olymp. C. "And Aristoxenus, a scholar of Aristotle's, had some Py-"thagorean acquaintance that were not very remote from "Pythagoras's own time."

That one Lysis a Pythagorean lived at Thebes with Epaminondas, is a thing not now to be questioned, since so many writers of good note have affirmed it.[i] But there is good reason to doubt whether this was the same Lysis that was an auditor of Pythagoras, though several of these authors expressly say it was he. For if we compute the interval of years between the sedition of Cylon and the age of Epaminondas, they will be found too many to be allowed for one life, even in Mr. D.'s own reckoning. For let us suppose with Mr. D. that Cylon fired the Pythagorean college at Olymp. LXXII. 3., though this appears to be set XVII. years too low. Lysis then at that time may be supposed about XX. years of age; for he and Archippus, being the youngest and the strongest, are said to have escaped out of the fire, in which their companions were burnt.[j] Now Epaminondas's age might be determined with sufficient exactness from the time of his death at the battle of Mantinea, Olymp. CIV. 2.; for he was then in the vigour of his years, and died fighting heroically.[k] But we can fix it precisely out of Plutarch;[l]

[h] De Cyclis Vet. p. 148. Conveniunt certè Scholæ Pythagoricæ διαδοχαί. (Plutarch.) Lysis enim, Pythagoræ in Magnâ Græciâ discipulus, Philippum Macedonem Alexandri M. patrem Thebis instituit atque Epaminondam, qui ipsi Olymp. c. superârunt; nec admodùm remoti erant à Pythagorâ ipso, quos vidit (Gellius, iv. 11.) Aristoxenus Peripateticus Aristotelis discipulus.

[i] Diod. Sic. in Excerpt., Cornel. Nepos, Pausanias, Ælian. in Var., Plutarch. de Socratis Genio, Porphyr., Jamblich., Hieronymus contra Rufinum.

[j] Porphyr. Jamb. p. 208. Οὗτοι τελεώτατοι ὄντες καὶ εὐρωστότατοι. Corrige Οὗτοί τε νεώτατοι. So Plutarch. de Socr. idem, p. 583. Νέων ὄντων ἔτι ῥώμῃ καὶ κουφότητι διωσαμένων τὸ πῦρ.

[k] Ἡρωικῶς. Diod.

[l] Plut. de Λάθε Βιώσας. Ἐπαμεινώνδας εἰς τεσσαρακοστὸν ἔτος ἀγνοηθεῖς, ... ὕστερον δὲ πιστευθεὶς καὶ ἄρξας.

who informs us, that he was XL. years old when he was first made *general;* which was Olymp. CII. 2.[m] He was born, then, at Olymp. XCII. 1.; and we must suppose he was no less than XX. years of age before the death of his tutor; otherwise he could not have made those mighty improvements under his discipline, that historians speak of. I conceive, all we have hitherto allowed in our computation is very fair and reasonable. And yet, at this rate, from the nativity of Lysis to the XXth year of Epaminondas there are CXIIX.* years; too long a time certainly for the life of Lysis, whom neither Lucian nor any one else have mentioned in their catalogues of long-lived men. Nay we must still stretch it out longer; for Plutarch,[n] telling a story of one Theanor a Pythagorean, who, upon the news of Lysis's death, was sent by the society out of Italy to Thebes, to perform some ceremonies at his sepulchre,[o] makes him arrive there the very time that the proscribed Thebans returned home, which was Olymp. C. 3.[p] If we admit this account, we must add fourteen years more to Lysis's life, which is already so much too long; for from the birth of Lysis to Olymp. C. 3., there are CXXXII. years. But we must prolong this life still further, according to Diodorus, who is followed by Mr. Dodwell. For Diodorus says,[q] that Philip of Macedon, the father of Alexander, was educated at Thebes under the same Pythagorean with Epaminondas, and made a considerable progress in philosophical knowledge. But we are certain that it was Olymp. CII. 4. when Philip was sent a

[m] Diodorus, 367. [* = CXVIII.—D.]

[n] Plut. de Socratis Dæmonio.

[o] Olympiodorus, in his MS. Commentary on Plato's *Phædon*, says it was Philolaus, one of those that escaped *ex incendio Cylonis*, who came to his master's Lysis's sepulchre at Thebes. Κύλων ἐφῆψε πῦρ τῷ διδασκαλείῳ, καὶ πάντες ἐκαύθησαν πλὴν δύο Φιλολάου καὶ Ἱππάρχου. Ἦλθεν οὖν ὁ Φιλόλαος εἰς Θήβας, ὀφείλων χοὰς τῷ οἰκείῳ διδασκάλῳ τεθνεῶτι καὶ ἐκεῖ τεθαμμένῳ ποιήσασθαι τῷ Λύσιδι. [*Adden.*]

[p] Diodor. 345.

[q] Diod. xvi. p. 407. Μετέσχεν ἐπὶ πλεῖον τῶν Πυθαγορείων λόγων· ἀμφοτέρων δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν, &c.

hostage to Thebes. This is expressly said by Diodorus,[r] and clearly intimated by Plutarch,[s] and fully confirmed from the account of Philip's age. For he died Olymp. CXI. 1.,[t] when he was XLVII. years old;[u] and consequently at Olymp. CII. 4. he was but XIV.; which is an age young enough in all reason for the understanding of the Pythagorean doctrines. If the same Lysis therefore was both scholar to Pythagoras and master to Philip, he must survive the sedition of Cylon (when we suppose him XX. years old) till Olymp. CII. 4. So that he must live in all CXLI. years. This is a life of such an extraordinary length, that, I am persuaded, even Mr. D. himself, rather than he will believe this, will come over to my opinion, that there were two Pythagoreans of the same name, and that historians have confounded two Lysis's together. And yet, in all this computation, I have followed Mr. D.'s own sentiment about the date of Cylon's conspiracy. But if we place it at Olymp. LXVIII. 2., which I conceive I have proved above to be the more probable opinion, then the longevity of Lysis will be still augmented more extravagantly, even to CLVIII. years.

Mr. Dodwell's next argument is taken out of A. Gellius, who, reporting a thing from Aristoxenus, a disciple of Aristotle's, says, *He seems to have had it from his acquaintance Xenophilus, and other ancient Pythagoreans, that lived at no great distance from Pythagoras's own age.*[v] But, as I humbly conceive, this expression of Gellius is too loose and general to determine so nice a point. For who can tell whether *haud multum* shall signify fifty years, or fourscore, or perhaps a hundred? This Xenophilus was preceptor to Aristoxenus,[w] who, upon the death, as it seems, of his Pytha-

[r] Diod. xv. p. 379. [s] Plut. in Pelopide. [t] Diod. xvi.

[u] Justin. ix. 8.—Pausanias says, *above* XLVI. Φίλιππος μὲν οὖν πρόσω βιώσας ἢ καὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἐτῶν. [*Adden.*]

[v] Gellius, iv. 11. Quam rem videtur (Aristoxenus) cognovisse ex Xenophilo [Pythagorico] familiari suo, et ex quibusdam aliis natu majoribus, qui ab ætate Pythagoræ haud multum aberant.

[w] Suidas in Ἀριστοξ.

gorean master, was a follower of Aristotle. Aristotle set up his school at Athens about Olymp. CXI.;[x] and without question Aristoxenus was one of the first of his scholars; for he expected to have succeeded him after his death, which he could not have presumed upon a short acquaintance. We will suppose then, that Xenophilus might die about Olymp. CX. But he lived above a hundred and five years, as Aristoxenus himself has told us.[y] He was born therefore about Ol. LXXXIII.; which is XXV. from Pythagoras's days according to Mr. Dodwell, and after the other reckoning LX. Either of these sums is *haud multum;* so that this point cannot be decided from that passage of Gellius. But there are other writers that speak more particularly of the successions of the Pythagorean school; and they perhaps may enable us to determine the controversy. "Pythagoras flourished," says Laërtius, "about the LX. Olymp., and his school continued "for nine or even ten generations. For the last of the Py-"thagoreans were Xenophilus, Phanto, Echecrates, Diocles, "and Polymnastus. These were known to Aristoxenus, and "had been the scholars of Philolaus and Eurytus."[z] But what does he call a generation? The very argument itself will assist us to find his meaning; for he proves from the interval between Olymp. LX. and the deaths of those last Pythagoreans, that the generations were nine or ten. He cannot then here allow XXX. or XXXIII. years to a generation, as those authors we have cited above did; for at that rate there would not be above six generations. But he seems to take a generation for XX. years, as Hesychius[a] and some others define it. Now if we reckon from Olymp. LX. to the death of Xenophilus, Olymp. CX., there are ten such generations. But

[x] At Olymp. CXI. 2., when Euænetus was Archon. Dionys. Halicarn. de Demosth. [*Adden.*]

[y] Apud Lucianum in Macrob.

[z] Laërt. in Pythag. Ἤκμαζε δὲ κατὰ τὴν ξ' Ὀλυμπιάδα, καὶ αὐτοῦ τὸ σύστημα διέμεινε μέχρι γενεῶν ἐννέα ἢ καὶ δέκα· τελευταῖοι γὰρ ἐγένοντο τῶν Πυθαγορείων, οὓς καὶ Ἀριστόξενος εἶδε, Ξενόφιλός τε, &c. The vulgar lection is ἐννεακαίδεκα; but the MSS. have it ἐννέα ἢ καὶ δέκα, which is the true reading.

[a] Hesych. v. γενεά. . . . . Τὴν δὲ γενεὰν ὁρίσαντται ἐτῶν οἱ μὲν εἴκοσι.

Xenophilus, being above 105 years of age when he died, may be supposed to have outlived all his school-fellows by one whole generation. So that here appears an evident reason why our author says *nine or even ten;* for they are but *nine,* if we count to the deaths of Phanto and Echecrates, and the generality of them: but if we measure to the long extent of the life of Xenophilus, who perhaps for XX. years together was the only genuine Pythagorean left in the world, they are even *ten* generations. Diodorus says, *The last of the Pythagoreans were alive at Ol.* CIII. 3.;[b] which wants but half a dozen years of nine generations. But the learned Mr. Dodwell's computation will in no wise agree with this passage of Laërtius. For Mr. D. sets the founding of the Pythagorean school XXX. years later than Laërtius does; which cuts the account shorter by a generation and a half. Tully says the Pythagorean sect continued *many generations*[c] after the death of their master; which expression seems not to favour those that would shorten the duration of it.

This I take to be a true explication of this place of Laërtius, which has given so much trouble to his interpreters. And, I conceive, it may be further confirmed by the testimony of Jamblichus, who, when he speaks of the successions of the Pythagorean school, makes Aristæus, Pythagoras's immediate successor, to have been *very near* VII. *generations before Plato.*[d] Now let us suppose Aristæus to have been LX. years old when he took Pythagoras's chair, about Olymp. LXVIII. 2.; for he was the eldest of all the society, and for that reason succeeded him.[e] He was born then at Olymp. LIII. 3. And from that time to the nativity of Plato, Olymp. LXXXVIII. 1., there are 138 years; which wants but two years of VII. generations. But if Mr. D.'s computation

[b] Diod. p. 386. Ἔτι δὲ τῶν Πυθαγορικῶν φιλοσόφων οἱ τελευτῶντες. [τελευταῖοι.]

[c] Cicer. Tuscul. i. Multa sæcula postea viguit.

[d] Jambl. p. 219. Ἀρισταῖος, ... ἑπτὰ γενεαῖς ἔγγιστα πρὸς Πλάτωνος. lege πρὸ Πλάτωνος.

[e] Jambl. p. 220. Παραδοῦναι Ἀρισταίῳ τὴν σχολὴν πρεσβυτάτῳ ὄντι.

were allowed, there would be 102 years only between Aristæus and Plato, that is, five generations.

The same Jamblichus has given us a list of the whole succession of the Pythagoreans, which, being very faulty in the present edition, I hope it will not be unacceptable to the reader to see some of it here corrected; and it will supply us with some considerable hints about the age of Pythagoras.

1. *Pythagoras.*
2. *Aristæus.*
3. *Mnemarchus, Pythagoras's son.*
4. *Bulagoras.*
5. *Tydas.*
6. *Aresas.*
7. *Diodorus.*
8. *Clinias, Philolaus, Theoridas, Eurytus, Archytas.*

Aristæus, he says, was not only made Pythagoras's successor, but *he had the honour to marry his widow Theano, and to be guardian to his son; and that because of his extraordinary knowledge in the Pythagorean doctrines.*[f] But this place is very corrupt in the original; and so is the next, where he says, *Mnemarchus the son of Pythagoras succeeded Aristæus.*[g] The name of Tydas[h] too seems to be wrong; but whatever his true name was, *he was so much concerned for the sacking of Crotona, which happened while he was travelling abroad, that he died with grief not long after his return. And he was the only person in the whole succession that had an immature death, all the rest living to an extreme old age.*[i] The next successor, Aresas, is quite lost by the Latin interpreter,

[f] Jambl. p. 220. Τῆς παιδοτροφίας καὶ τοῦ Θεανοῦς γάμου κατηξιώθη, διά τε ἐξαιρέσεως περικεκρατηκέναι τῶν δογμάτων. lege διὰ τὸ ἐξαιρέτως; as the annotator has observed.

[g] Ibid. Μεθ' ὃν ἡγήσασθαι Μνήμαρχον τὸν Πυθαγόραν. lege Πυθαγόρα.

[h] Ibid. Μεθ' ὃν γὰρ Τύδαν. forte, μεθ' ὃν Γορτύδαν, vel simile quid.

[i] Ibid. Ἐναδήμονα γενέσθαι τοῦτον, ὡς ὑπὸ λύπης προὔλιπε τὸν βίον. lege Ἕνα δὴ μόνον γ. τοῦτον ὃς ὑπὸ.

who translates *ἀρέσαν tulerunt*;[j] as if he had read it *ἤρεσαν*. But the passage is plain and easy, if we write it with a capital letter, to denote it a proper name.

Well, we see here are no fewer than eight lives in the Pythagorean succession; and this very number is attested by another ancient writer, who says, *Plato was the ninth successor from Pythagoras, having been the disciple of Archytas.*[k] Now 'tis known that Plato conversed with the Pythagoreans in Italy about Olymp. XCV.;[l] to which time, from the death of Pythagoras, according to Mr. D.'s scheme, there are no more than LXX. years; which without question is too small an allowance, being but X. years apiece to the several successors. Whereas we know, in the Peripatetic school Aristotle presided XIII. years, Theophrastus after him about XXXIV., and then Strato XVIII., and then Lycon XLII. In the same manner, if we examine the Platonic, or Stoic, or Epicurean successions, and compute by a middle rate, and allow the same measure to the Pythagoreans, we shall find a necessity of dating the original of the Pythagorean school as high as it is placed in our table; which is LXXVI. years earlier than Mr. D. has set it.

Now, to sum up the evidence about the Pythagorean succession; first, Laërtius says, the sect continued *nine* or *ten* generations; then Jamblichus says, Aristæus, the second in the Pythagorean line, was about *seven* generations before Plato, who was scholar to the last of the Pythagoreans; and Photius's author says, Plato was the *tenth* successor from Pythagoras. All these accounts, conspiring so together, seem to make the thing pretty certain. But yet, in the particulars that Jamblichus has given us relating to this succession there are some things unaccountable; whether they be owing to the ill copies of Jamblichus's book, or to the

[j] Ibid. *Χρόνῳ μέντοι γε ὕστερον ἀρέσαν ἐκ τῶν Λευκάνων σωθέντα.* lege *Ἀρέσαν.*

[k] Scriptor vitæ Pyth. apud Photium. *Ἕνατος ἀπὸ Πυθαγόρου διάδοχος γέγονε Πλάτων, Ἀρχύτου τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου μαθητὴς γενόμενος.*

[l] Laërt. in Platone.

author himself, I cannot tell. As when he says, *that in the time of Bulagoras, the* FOURTH *in the succession, the city of Crotona was taken and sacked:*[m] I suppose he means the time when Dionysius the elder conquered the Crotonians and the neighbouring cities, and held them in slavery for many years, as we are taught by Diodorus,[n] Dionysius Halic., and Livy; which happened at Olymp. XCVIII. 1. Now Plato was XL. years old at the time of this Olympiad; and this Bulagoras is but the second from Aristæus in the line of succession: how then can this be consistent with what Jamblichus has said before, that Plato was near seven generations from the time of Aristæus?

Again; Jamblichus[o] puts Diodorus the Aspendian in the line of succession before Philolaus, and Eurytus, and Archytas, the youngest of whom was preceptor to Plato. But this Diodorus appears to have been younger than Plato himself. For Plato died above LXXX. years old, at Olymp. CVIII. 1. But Diodorus[p] was an acquaintance of Stratonicus the musician, who was in the court of Ptolemæus Lagi;[q] which must be after Olymp. CXIV. Again; Archestratus the Syracusian was junior to Plato; as we may gather from Athenæus's words; *Archestratus,* says he, *knows not, that in Plato's Convivium there were* XXVIII. *guests.*[r] But Archestratus mentions this Diodorus as a person then alive, in these elegant verses;

Ἀλλ' οὐ πολλοὶ ἴσασι βροτῶν τόδε θεῖον ἔδεσμα,
Οὐδ' ἔσθειν ἐθέλουσιν, ὅσοι κούφην τελεβώδη
Ψυχὴν κέκτηνται θνητῶν, εἰσὶν δ' ἀπόπληκτοι,
Ὡς ἀνθρωποφάγου τοῦ θηρίου ὄντος. ἅπας δὲ
Ἰχθὺς σάρκα φιλεῖ βροτέην, ἄν που περικύρσῃ·
Ὥστε πρέπει καθαρῶς, ὁπόσοι τάδε μωρολογοῦσι,

[m] Jambl. p. 220. *Ἐφ' οὗ διαφθαρθῆναι συνέβη τὴν Κροτωνιατῶν πόλιν.*
[n] Diod. 317. Dionys. in Excerpt. p. 539. Livy, l. xxiv.
[o] Jambl. 220. [p] Athen. p. 163. [= II. 136. *ed. Schw.*—D.]
[q] Id. 350. [= III. 291. *ed. Schw.*—D.]
[r] Athen. p. 4. [= I. 17. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

Τοῖς λαχάνοις προσάγειν, καὶ πρὸς Διόδωρον ἰόντας
*Τὸν σοφὸν, ἐγκρατέως μετ' ἐκείνου Πυθαγορίζειν.**

They are fools, says he, that refuse to eat the dog-fish, because it devours human bodies; for any fish will eat man's flesh, if it find it. So that they that are scrupulous upon that account, must live upon salads, and go to Diodorus, and turn Pythagoreans. The second verse the learned Casaubon has observed to be faulty;

—— *ὁπόσοι* [*ὅσοι*] *κούφην τελεβώδη*
Ψυχὴν κέκτηνται·

for there's no such word as *τελεβώδης*. He offers a double emendation of it; one, *κούφην κἐρεβώδη*, the other, *οἱ κούφην κἐλλεβορώδη*. But the first of these cannot be allowed; for it ought to be *κᾰρεβώδη*, and then the first syllable will be long. The second is too remote from the common reading. After so great a man, it will be pardonable if I mistake in my conjecture. The same verse comes again in pag. 310 [=III. 137. *ed. Schw.*]; and there it is — *ὅσοι κούφαν γε λεβώδη*. I would correct it,

—— *ὅσοι κοῦφ' ἀττελεβώδη*
Ψυχὴν κέκτηνται.

Ἀττέλεβος is a locust, or sort of grasshopper; he means

[* Athen. II. 135. *ed. Schw.*, who, adopting our author's last conjecture, gives the second line,

Οὐδ' ἔσθειν ἐθέλουσ' ὅσσοι κεφαττελεβώδη.

Neither of Bentley's corrections satisfied Toup: "Expellenda omninò vox *κούφην*, quæ nihil aliud est quàm interpretatio *τοῦ, ἀττελεβώδη*. Et locus ita legendus est:

Οὐδ' ἔσθειν ἐθέλουσιν ὅσοι τὴν ἀττελεβώδη
Ψυχὴν κέκτηνται θνητῶν.

Ἀττέλεβος est *animalculum alatum*. Quod alio nomine *ψυχὴν* vocant Græci. Hesych. *Ψυχὴ, πνεῦμα, καὶ* ΖΩΤΦΙΟΝ ΠΤΗΝΟΝ. (N. *Animalculum alatum. All soul, and no body.* Vide Cl. Salmasium ad Spartiani Adrianum, et doctissimum Piersonum ad Mœrin, p. 397.) Hinc argutè Archestratus, *ψυχὴν ἀττελεβώδη*. Atque hoc verum." *Emend.* (*Ep. Crit.*) *in Suid.* II. 520.—D.]

persons of a *light and desultory temper*, that skip about, and are blown with every wind, as grasshoppers are. But I would go a little further, and join the words together thus, ὅσοι κεπφαττελεβώδη. Κέπφος is a small light sort of bird, that is tossed about with the wind, and is metaphorically taken for a foolish light-witted fellow. See Hesychius, the Scholiast on Aristoph., and others. So that κεπφαττελεβώδης is a very fit compound from κέπφος and ἀττέλεβος.

But it is time to take notice of another contradiction in this account of Jamblichus. For in another place he makes Philolaus, and Eurytus, and Archytas, contemporaries with Pythagoras;[s] though here we see he has placed them at seven generations from him. 'Tis a wonder, that in so short a work he should be so often inconsistent with himself. But which of his assertions shall we follow? No doubt, that which he says oftenest, and which agrees best with what others have said. And what can be more express than his own words? *In so many generations nobody had ever seen one of the Pythagorean books, till Philolaus's time.*[t] Does he not here declare there were *many generations* between Pythagoras and Philolaus? And Laërtius has preserved for us one of Archytas's letters to Plato, who had desired to purchase the writings of Ocellus Lucanus: and there Archytas says, *He had made an inquiry after them, and had spoken with the grandchildren of Ocellus about them.*[u] Here are plainly three generations between Archytas and Ocellus: and yet nobody has said, that even Ocellus himself was contemporary with Pythagoras. And so much by way of inquiry about the age of that philosopher.

[s] Jambl. p. 103. Οἱ παλαιότατοι καὶ αὐτῷ συγχρονίσαντες, καὶ μαθητεύσαντες τῷ Πυθαγόρᾳ πρεσβύτῃ νέοι, Φιλόλαός τε, καὶ Εὔρυτος, ... Ἀρχύτας τε ὁ πρεσβύτερος, &c.

[t] Id. p. 172. Ἐν τοσαύταις γενεαῖς ἐτῶν οὐδεὶς οὐδενὶ φαίνεται τῶν Πυθαγορείων ὑπομνημάτων περὶ τετευχέως πρὸ τῆς Φιλολάου ἡλικίας. lege περιτετευχέναι. [" Lenius est, περιτετυχώς." *Dobree, Advers.* ii. 366.—D.]

[u] Laërt. in Arch. Ἀφήλθομες ὡς Λευκανὼς, καὶ ἐνετεύχομες τοῖς Ὀκέλλω ἐκγόνοις.

The very learned Mr. Dodwell[v] has advanced some other arguments to establish his opinion about Phalaris's age, which must here be considered. In the pretended *Epistles*[w] there is mention of one Clisthenes, who was banished, it seems, out of some democratical city, but the name is not set down. This person Mr. D. supposes to be the famous Clisthenes the Athenian, who had almost as great a share in driving out the family of Pisistratus, as Brutus the Roman had in expelling the Tarquins. Now Pisistratus's sons were driven out at Olymp. LXVII. 1.[x] And there must be an interval of some years between that and Clisthenes's exile. Phalaris therefore, who relieves Clisthenes after his banishment, must have been still in the throne about Olymp. LXVIII.; that is, XL. years after Eusebius's period, which I follow as a rule and standard through all my *Dissertation*.

But I must here again profess my sorrow to see this excellently learned writer so imposed on by these spurious *Letters*. For all this affair of Clisthenes was no where but in the Sophist's head; neither is the scene of it laid at Athens. For our Phalaris's Clisthenes was the son of Autonoë,[y] a kinswoman of the Tyrant's; but the Athenian's mother was called Agariste, as Herodotus[z] and Ælian[a] assure us; and a niece of the same Clisthenes, the mother of Pericles,[b] was called Agariste, in memory of the other. Perhaps it may be suspected that Autonoë in the *Epistles* may be only a mother-in-law. But this I think would be a sorry evasion; though we had not that direct answer to it, which the *Letters* themselves afford us, where they call her *his own mother*.[c] If the fault be laid on the copies of Phalaris, and Autonoë be supposed a corruption of the true word Agariste, there will be no dealing upon this argument with such masters of defence. But then, again, Phalaris's Clisthenes was fined three talents, and all he had was seized

[v] De Cyclis Vet. p. 253. [w] Phal. Epist. 77, 95, 110.
[x] Marm. Arund. [y] Ep. 95. [z] Herod. vi. 126.
[a] Ælian. xii. 24. [b] Herod. vi. 131. Plutarch. in Pericle.
[c] Ep. 110. Παρὰ τῆς σεαυτοῦ μητρός.

on and confiscated to the public use.[d] Now this story will never suit with the circumstances of the Athenian Clisthenes, who, being banished, as Ælian says,[e] by way of exostracism, must consequently have the free use and enjoyment of his estate all the time of his exile. For this was one difference between exostracism and ordinary banishment, that the former allowed to the person the entire right of his own revenues.[f] Herodotus so represents this transaction, as if Clisthenes had quitted Athens by order of Cleomenes, king of Sparta, without suffering any exostracism. But even this account sufficiently proves that he was not the Clisthenes in the *Epistles;* for here was no fine nor confiscation of goods, if he only retired in obedience to Cleomenes. *Clisthenes the Athenian,* says Cicero, *having a mistrust of his affairs, deposited money for his daughters' portions in Juno's temple at Samos.*[g] This mistrust appears to have been a little before his banishment: and if he had money of his own lodged then in Samos, it is pretty hard to believe that he would send a-begging to Sicily, the quite contrary way, and so much further than Samos. But what need of many words? Let but any body read the history of Clisthenes in Herodotus; and then look upon the *Letters,* where he will not find one circumstance mentioned, not so much as Athens named, nor Clisthenes's rival Isagoras, nor Cleomenes, but some general heads only, and common-places: and let him believe, if he can, that the writer of those *Epistles* speaks of the Athenian. Or if he do speak of him, even this may go among the other arguments to detect him a Sophist.

Mr. Dodwell[h] adds one little suspicion more towards settling the age of Phalaris. There is one Epistle directed to Hiero, and two to Epicharmus.[i] Now if this Epicharmus be the comic poet, and this Hiero the tyrant of Syracuse,

[d] Ep. 95.

[e] Ælian. xiii. 24.

[f] Plutarch. in Aristide. Ἐξεκήρυττον εἰς ἔτη δέκα καρπούμενον τὰ ἑαυτοῦ. Suid. v. Ὀστρακισμός. Schol. Arist. 238 and 344.

[g] Cicero de Legibus, ii. 16. Cùm rebus timeret suis.

[h] De Cyclis Vet. p. 253.

[i] Ep. 86, 61, 98.

their ages will agree well with Mr. D.'s notion, that makes him alive at Olymp. LXXII. But I will not lose any time in refuting this suspicion, since Mr. D. himself seems not to rely upon it. 'Tis enough, if we remark that there's not the least hint in the *Letters*, that the Epicharmus there was a poet; which the author, had he meant the comedian, would hardly have omitted, if we may guess at his humour by his many letters to Stesichorus. As for Hiero, the *Epistles* have represented him as a citizen of Leontini; where the Hiero of Syracuse had no concern, that we know of.

And now, I think, I have gone through the most memorable passages that have relation either to Phalaris's or Pythagoras's age; and I have considered all that Mr. Dodwell has made use of to support his new assertions. I do not pretend to pass my own judgment, or to determine positively on either side; but I submit the whole to the censure of such readers as are well versed in ancient learning; and particularly to that incomparable historian and chronologer, the Right Reverend the Bishop of Coventry and Litchfield.*

I.

In the last Epistle, to those of Enna, a city of Sicily, Phalaris says the Hyblenses and Phintienses had promised to lend him money at interest; Οἱ δὲ ὑπέσχηντο δανείσειν, ὡς Ὑβλαῖοι καὶ Φιντιεῖς. The Sophist was careful to mention such cities as he knew were in Sicily. For so Ptolemy places Φιντία there;[j] and Antoninus, Phintis;[k] and Pliny, Phintienses.[l] But it is ill luck for this forger of letters, that a fragment of Diodorus, a Sicilian, and well acquainted with the history of his country, was preserved to be

[* Dr. William Lloyd. *Note on ed.* 1777.]

[j] Ptol. p. 79.

[k] Anton. p. 21.

[l] Plin. iii. 8.

a witness against him. That excellent writer informs us, that Phintias Tyrant of Agrigentum (the very place where Phalaris was before him), first built Phintia, calling it by his own name; Κτίζει δὲ Φιντίας πόλιν, ὀνομάσας αὐτὴν Φιντιάδα; and that this was done while the Romans were at war with king Pyrrhus, that is about Ol. CXXV.;[m] which is above CCLXX. years after Phalaris's death, taking even the later account of St. Hierom. A pretty slip this of our Sophist, who, like the rest of his profession, was more versed in the books of orators than historians, to introduce his Tyrant borrowing money of a city almost CCC. years before it was named or built.

The preliminaries about Phalaris's age being agreed on between Mr. B. and me; for he consents to place him, as I have done, at Olymp. LVII. 3.; we are at last come to the business itself. And what does the learned Examiner advance against our first argument?

For method's *sake*, says he, *the Doctor begins at the* last *Epistle* (p. 122). For modesty's sake, the gentleman begins with a very worthy cavil. As if I was not to rank my arguments according to their force, rather than to take them as they happen to rise? But he will find by and by, that I put this argument in the front, because it's one of the strongest, and can never be eluded.

But the copies of Phalaris have Ἰαλαῖοι, *and I make use of the Examiner's conjecture* Ἰβλαῖοι (p. 122). I conceive it's but a small fault to *make use* of it in a citation, if I do not assume it to myself. But he resents, I suppose, that I did not name him, and give him the glory of his correction. If that be it, I can heartily excuse him; for his true emendations being so very few, he has reason to look after them.

[m] Diod. p. 867.

But, to speak freely, the correction is so very easy, that the honour of it is but moderate. For, *if in all the editions of Phalaris it has been* Ἑαλαῖοι; the reason was, that, before Mr. B. arose, nobody of eminent learning would debase himself by the publication of those *Epistles*.

But granting it to be Ὑβλαῖοι, *whether any of the Sicilian Hyblas be here meant, is dubious* (p. 122). Though all this be wide from the question, for I fetch no argument from Hybla, yet it has a worse quality than that, for it is not true. *I have sent*, says Phalaris, *over* ALL SICILY *to borrow money at interest; and some freely gave me money, as the Leontines and Geloans; others promised to lend me, as the Hyblæans and Phintians.*[n] Is it dubious now, whether any of the Hyblas of Sicily be meant in this place? does he not say expressly, that he sent to borrow in Sicily? I am sorry our Honourable Editor is no better versed in his own author: I am glad, I would say; for 'tis to be hoped he employs his time better.

I may now put in one word about those Ἑαλαῖοι, *a people that are not in Sicily: so that I was unlucky in saying, The Sophist took care to mention such towns as he knew were in Sicily* (p. 122). Though the Examiner's emendation Ὑβλαῖοι be so obvious and certain, yet he is half in the mind to renounce his own correction out of pure contradiction to me. Let it then be Ἑαλαῖοι, to humour him a little. What spoils now does the Examiner carry with him, but a manifest detection that his *Epistles* are a cheat? For the writer declares *that it was Sicily* where he borrowed his money: but when he comes to name those that lent it, he talks of Ἑαλαῖοι, *which are no where in Sicily*. Now a Sophist might be guilty of this mistake; but the true Phalaris could not.

At last the Examiner is come to the merits of the cause; for he will prove there were two Phintias in Sicily. "For "the Phintia built by Phintias, which is mentioned in Dio-

[n] Ep. 148. Εἰς ἅπασαν Σικελίαν.

" dorus,[o] was a *maritime* town; but the Phintia of Ptolemy[p] " and Pliny[q] was *mediterranean* (p. 122): and this latter " may be the place that is meant in the *Epistles*."

This it is to have a reach of thought, and a sagacity peculiar to a great genius. These are the very passages that I had cited; and yet so dull was I, that I could not discover that the authors spoke of different Phintias. For I fancied, if Pliny or Ptolemy had meant another Phintia besides that of Diodorus, they would have given us an account of two; for Diodorus's Phintia was too considerable to be omitted. Since therefore they mention one only, 'twas a plain argument to me, that they knew but of one. Nay, I went further, and imagined I had found the true reason why these authors disagreed so in the account of its situation. For when a city is situated but a little within land, near the mouth of a river, as Phintia was, 'tis no wonder that writers differ, some calling it a maritime town, because it is near the sea, and has a harbour for ships; others calling it an inland town, because it really lies within land, and not in the verge of the sea-coast. As in the very same place Ptolemy reckons Agrigentum among the mediterranean towns; though Pliny and every body else call it a sea-town: for, as Polybius says,[r] it was seated XVIII. stadia, one league only, within the mouth of the river. And the same Ptolemy calls Gela and Camarina inland towns for the very same reason; though every novice in geography knows they were maritime. Virgil[s] describes the promontories and sea-towns of Sicily, that Æneas saw, as he coasted it:

Hinc altas rupes projectaque saxa Pachyni*
Radimus; et, fatis nunquam concessa moveri,
Apparet CAMARINA *procul, campique Geloi,*
Immanisque GELA *fluvii cognomine dicta:*
Arduus inde AGRAGAS *ostentat maxima longè*
Mœnia, magnanimúm quondam generator equorum.

[o] Diod. p. 867. [p] Ptol. iii. 4. [q] Plin. iii. 8.
[r] Polyb. ix. [s] Æn. iii. [699.—D.] [* Eds. "*cautes*."—D.]

Here, we see, are three maritime cities, Camarina, Gela, and Agrigentum: will our Examiner therefore double these, as he has done Phintia, because Ptolemy calls them mediterranean? If he pleases to publish a new map of Sicily, with these noble discoveries in it, he will meet with his deserved applause.

But the gentleman proceeds, and tells us, *Phintia in the Epistle must therefore be the mediterranean town, because Hybla, which is there joined with it, is mediterranean.*[t] *This*, he says, *is a way of arguing that I myself use in the next section* (p. 123); which I will shew him to be mistaken in, when I come to that paragraph. In the mean time, why so positive that this Hybla in the Epistle must needs be mediterranean? Did he not newly say, *it is dubious whether any of the Sicilian Hyblas be there meant?* and the supposed Hyblas out of Sicily might be maritime, for aught he knows. But allow this to be a Sicilian Hybla: were all of that name in Sicily mediterranean towns? This he must affirm, or else his argument is lame of one foot, which we ought not to suspect in so great a logician. To be sure then, he imagines that all the Hyblas of Sicily were inland cities: as it farther appears from his Index to Phalaris;[u] where that Hybla that was really maritime is described to be mediterranean: a manifest error, and plainly refuted by Thucydides,[v] Cicero, Virgil, Ovid, Mela, Pliny, and others. So very happy is our Examiner in every step he takes.

But he fancies, *I may maintain, that all those authors, Diodorus, Ptolemy, and Pliny, may mean the same Phintia* (p. 123). (And if all his fancies were as true as this, I would not write one word against him.) *If so, why may not Diodorus be mistaken as much in the* date *of this town, as two good witnesses prove him to be in the* situation *of it?*

I have already shewn, that none of them were mistaken in the situation of Phintia; for they all knew that it was a

[t] Ep. 148. Ὑβλαῖοι καὶ Φιντιεῖς.

[u] V. Megarenses . . . Hyblæi . . . quorum urbs Megara . . . mediterranea.

[v] See Cluverius's Sicil. 133.

port-town seated a little within land, near the mouth of the river Himera. The only difference is in the name; some calling such a situation maritime, others mediterranean. But that it was really a port-town, there are two as good witnesses on Diodorus's side; Antonine in his Itinerary,[w] and Cicero:[x] so that we have three testimonies against two. But let us see what evidence may be produced from matter of fact. *Carthalo, the Carthaginian admiral, hearing the Roman fleet was gone from Syracuse, came towards them with* CX. *sail: the Romans, not daring to engage him, got into the harbour of Phintia; whither the Carthaginians pursued them, and sunk* 67 *of their ships, and disabled* 13. *Soon after, the Roman consul, knowing nothing of what had happened, comes from Messana with* 36 *sail, and cast anchor before Phintia.* This action is told at large in Diodorus;[y] and can we think all this a mere dream of his, *written when he was fast asleep,* as our Examiner expresses it? (p. 137.) He was born within 60 miles of Phintia; and surely he, that travelled through Europe and Asia to view the places he wrote of,[z] could scarce be so ignorant at home, as to make whole fleets engage and be sunk upon dry land. But if the Examiner will still remain obstinate against Diodorus and the rest, I have one witness more in reserve, whom, I dare say, he'll allow to be a good one. 'Tis the Honourable Charles Boyle, Esquire, the learned Editor of Phalaris, who in his Index there has these very words; *Phintia, now called Lycata, a maritime town in the east of Sicily, not a mediterranean as Ptolemy calls it.*[a] Here's an authority beyond all exception, not only that there was a maritime Phintia, but that Phalaris meant it. The gentleman perhaps may blush at this passage; and therefore I will not bear hard

[w] P. 21. Per maritima loca, &c.

[x] iii. in Verrem. Coge ut ad *aquam* tibi . . . frumentum . . . metiantur, vel Phintiam, vel Halesam, &c.

[y] Diod. 880.

[z] Diod. in Præf.

[a] Phintia, hodie Lycata, urbs maritima in orientali Siciliæ latere; non mediterranea, ut Ptolemæus.

upon him, but only ask him one short question. *Phintia a maritime town*, says the Editor; *a mediterranean*, says the Examiner. Now whether's harder to be proved, that the maritime and the mediterranean are the same town, or that the Editor and the Examiner are the same person?

But let us observe the inference he makes from this *error*, as he thought it, of Diodorus; for here we may expect the very quintessence of logic. *Why may not Diodorus be mistaken as much in the* date *of this town, as he is in the* situation *of it?* (p. 123.) Now the mistake in the *situation*, even supposing it a mistake, might perhaps be five mile[s]; for that's enough to denominate it an inland town. But the mistake about the *date* must be no less than CCLXX. years; for any thing less than that will do the *Epistles* no service. So that here lies the true import of our Examiner's query; If Diodorus might mistake a league or two, why might he not mistake CCLXX. years? that is, if Milo the Crotonian could carry a bull, why might he not carry a brace of elephants?

But that Diodorus has not mistook himself in his account of the *date* of Phintia, any more than in the situation, we may be as sure as any history can make us. (1.) For, first, he could not mistake in the age of Phintias the Tyrant. He has involved him in so many circumstances, and linked him with so many contemporaries, that a man must hate his own reputation who will presume to say that this Phintias was older than Phalaris. He had war with Hicetas Tyrant of Syracuse;[b] that Hicetas that had another war with Mæno the poisoner of Agathocles, and was succeeded by Thynio, or Thœno, an ally of king Pyrrhus. He is mentioned with Decius Jubellius the Roman tribune,[c] whose age we know from Polybius, and Livy, and Appian. He had concerns with the Mamertines of Messana,[d] a people never heard of in Sicily before the age of Agathocles. He razed to the very ground the city of Gela,[e] which a whole cloud of historians

[b] Diodor. lib. xxii.
[c] Diod. ibid. et Excerpt. Vales. 265.
[d] Ibid.
[e] Ibid.

witness to have been standing long after Phalaris's time. What man of common modesty or sense will say all these actions are confounded, and that Phintias lived three centuries before? Can so excellent an historian be suspected of such a gross piece of negligence? 'Tis as absurd, as to affirm that the right Reverend the Bishop of Sarum, in his immortal *History of the Reformation*, may have mistaken the affairs of Henry the III. for those of Henry the VIII.

There's a medal in Goltzius and Paruta with this inscription, *ΒΑCΙΛΕΩΣ ΦΙΝΤΙΑ:* on one side it has a dog, and on the other a head crowned with laurel. Goltzius thinks it's the head of Gelo, and that *ΦΙΝΤΙΑ* means the city Phintia. And the learned Harduin concurs with him, that *ΦΙΝΤΙΑ* relates to the city, and not to a person.[f] But I am entirely of Paruta's opinion, who interprets it of king Phintias. For is not *Βασιλέως Φιντία* in the genitive case, exactly like those other inscriptions, *ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΔΙΟΝΤΣΙΟΥ, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΙΕΡΩΝΤΜΟΥ, ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ?* And the inscription is placed in the same manner in all of them; not where the head is, but upon the reverse. Besides the very word *ΒΑCΙΛΕΩΣ* shews it belongs not to Gelo. For in his and his brother Hiero's coins that word is not used; Dionysius, as it seems, being the first Sicilian that styled himself *Βασιλεὺς* in his money. Without question therefore this Phintias was a long time after Phalaris's age; as appears not only from the word *Βασιλέως*, but from the head with the laurel. For it was not the custom in Phalaris's time for princes to set their images upon the public money.

(2.) Neither could Diodorus mistake in the second part, that this Phintias founded the city Phintia, and called it after his own name. 'Tis observable, that he says it more than once: *Phintias*, says he, *builds a city, naming it Phintia;* and in another place, *Phintias, the founder of Phintia.*[g]

[f] Harduin, Nummi Antiqui illustrati.

[g] Diod. p. 868. *Κτίζει δὲ Φιντίας πόλιν ὀνομάσας αὐτὴν Φιντιάδα*, and *Φιντίας ὁ Φιντιάδος κτίστωρ.*

He is very particular in the circumstances of it. *The Mamertines,*[h] says he, *of Messana having sacked the city of Gela, Phintias king of Agrigentum pulls down all the houses and the walls of the place, and removes the people that were left, and builds a city for them* (within the territory of Agrigentum) *with good fortifications, and a fine market-place and temples.*[i] Will our Examiner say, that all these buildings were castles in the air? No; but perhaps there might be a city there called Phintia before, and Phintias might only repair it. No doubt on't: he was at all that trouble and expense purely for the sake of a *refreshing quibble* (p. 133). The town was a name-sake of his, and therefore he would rebuild it. By the same argument, there was an Alexandria before Alexander, and a Rome before Romulus. But nobody heard, you'll say, of these names before the times of those founders. No matter for that: who ever heard of Phintia before Phintias's time? Yet our Examiner can give you a view of it in the region of possibilities.

Give me leave to add one short remark about the building of Phintia. Diodorus has passed his word, that the city of Gela was quite razed and dispeopled before Phintia was built; and that the residue of the Geloans were transplanted to this new Phintia, and from that time were called *Phintienses.* But the pretended author of the *Epistles* mentions the Geloans and Phintienses as different people; as if Gela and Phintia were both standing at once. *The Leontines,* says he, *and Geloans gave me money; the Hyblenses and Phintienses promised to lend.*[j] So that here we have a double discovery that the *Epistles* are spurious: first, because they talk of the Phintians, a name not heard of in Phalaris's time; and then because they make them quite different from the Geloans, though they were both the same people, the new city arising out of the reliques of the old.

Mr. Boyle is pleased to end this paragraph with a little innocent mirth. *Unless,* says he, *this Phintia be such another*

[h] Diod. p. 874. [i] Diod. p. 868. [j] Ep. 148.

place as Agrigent, a sea-port town in the middle of Sicily (p. 123). Those words of mine that he refers to are, *The Letters are dated in the middle of Sicily*:[k] where there is not one syllable about Agrigentum; but he adds that of his own, to make way for his jest. But pray, Sir, where had you the secret, that all Phalaris's *Letters* were dated at Agrigentum? Does not Suidas say, he was master of all Sicily?[l] do not the *Letters* pretend, that he conquered the Leontines, the Tauromenites, the Zanclæans? did he not vanquish the Sicani, the inhabitants of the midland country?[m] and could he not write a letter in any of these expeditions, as well as at home? or were ink and paper such heavy baggage, that they could not be carried after him? By the subject of several of the *Letters*, one would guess they were dated from the castle where his bull was kept, which was XVIII. miles from Agrigentum.[n] But for the most part they are such common-place stuff, without any note of place or time, that one cannot tell where nor when they were written. And the reader may observe this, as another mark of their spuriousness. But what then, if I had meant Agrigentum, when I said, *The Letters are dated in the middle of Sicily?* Is not Agrigentum in the very middle of the island, between the east and west points of it, Pachynus and Lilybæum? And, I conceive, there's a middle of a line, as well as of a surface. And how if Agrigentum be a mediterranean town, what will then become of your jest? I have two very good authors to bear it out: Ptolemy in his Tables, that reckons it among the μεσόγειοι, *midland cities;* and Mr. Boyle in his Index to Phalaris, *Agrigent*, says he, *a mediterranean city*.[o] If Mr. Boyle *be so quarrelsome, that he cannot agree with himself, how is it possible for other people to agree with him?* (p. 119.)

If the reader now pleases to review what the Examiner has said upon this first argument, he will join with me in

[k] Diss. p. 50. [l] Suid. v. Φαλ. [m] Polyænus, v. 1.
[n] Diod. 741. [o] Agrigentum .... urbs mediterranea.

this character of it, That all the authorities he has brought were already in my *Dissertation;* and that all his inferences are false, and may have the honour to be his own.

II.

In the XCII. Epistle he threatens Stesichorus the poet for raising money and soldiers against him at Aluntium and Alæsa, καὶ εἰς Ἀλούντιον καὶ εἰς Ἄλαισαν; and that perhaps he might be snapt before he got home again from Alæsa to Himera, ἐξ Ἀλαίσης εἰς Ἱμέραν. What a pity 'tis again, that the Sophist had not read Diodorus! for he would have told him that this Alæsa was not in being in Phalaris's days. It was first built by Archonides, a Sicilian, Olymp. XCIV. 2.;[p] or, as others say, by the Carthaginians, about two years before.[q] So that here are above CXL. years slipt, since the latest period of Phalaris. And we must add above a dozen more to the reckoning, upon the Sophist's own score: for this letter is supposed to bear date before Stesichorus and Phalaris were made friends, which was a dozen years, as he tells his tale,[r] before Stesichorus died; and Phalaris he makes to survive him. I am aware, that the same author says, that there were other cities in Sicily called Alæsa;[s] but it is evident from the situation, that this Alæsa of Archonides is meant in the *Epistles;* for this lies on the same coast with Himera and Aluntium (to which two the Sophist here joins it), and is at a small distance from them. And indeed there was no other

[p] Diod. p. 246.
[q] P. 247.
[r] Epist. 103.
[s] Diod. ibid.

town of that name in the days of the Sophist, the rest being ruined and forgotten long before.

If our Examiner's performance in the last section was very poor and jejune, we may expect an amends in this. For, to encourage himself with a small victory, he begins his attack upon a fault of the press, CXX. for CXL.; though it was nothing to his subject, even allowing it to be my own mistake. And, being flushed with this little advantage over the printer, he then proceeds with his victorious forces against the argument itself. But we shall see by the event, that not the Author of the *Epistles* only, but one of his Editors too, may be guilty of sophistry.

The Doctor, says he, *finds Stesichorus in danger of being snapt in his intended journey from Alæsa to Himera* (p. 123). Now, with the Examiner's leave, the Doctor was more inclined to think it a *voyage* than a *journey*; for both Himera, where Stesichorus lived, and Alæsa and Aluntium, whither he went, are maritime towns. And the very words of Phalaris confirmed the Doctor in this opinion; for he makes this sarcasm upon Stesichorus: *I hear*, says he, *you are writing Νόστους, the return of the Greeks from Troy: but you take no thought for your own return from Alæsa to Himera. But it shall be hard for you to escape my hands; and that shall be as bad to you as the Capharean rocks and Charybdis were to them.*[t] There's a greater propriety in this comparison, if Stesichorus was to come home by sea than if he was to come by land. And 'twas at sea, as it's pretended,[u] that he was snapt at last, as he was sailing from Pachynus to Peloponnesus.

I observed, that, because there had been several Alæsas in Sicily, this argument would be of no force unless we could know which of them was meant in the *Epistles*. And that, I thought, might be determined from the very circumstances of the action. Stesichorus is supposed to sail from

[t] Ep. 92. [u] Ep. 108.

Himera to Alæsa and Aluntium. Now, the Alæsa of Archonides being a sea-port town, and lying exactly in the way between Himera and Aluntium, there was no question, as I thought, but this was the place mentioned in the *Epistles;* especially since there is good reason to suppose that the other Alæsas (if there were any other) were mediterranean towns: for if they had been port towns, and more ancient than the age of Phalaris, 'tis almost impossible but that in the Punic, or Athenian, or Roman, or civil wars in Sicily, there must have been some naval action there; and then the historians could never have been so ignorant of them, as it appears they all were.

But Mr. B. desires *to borrow this argument for a moment, and he will prove just the contrary to what I have proved, that this Alæsa is not upon the same coast with Aluntium* (p. 124). I perceive 'tis dangerous *lending* this gentleman any thing. He borrowed the MS. *Phalaris,* and now he borrows an argument; but he makes a wrong use of both of them, and then calumniates him that lent them. First, he quite mistakes the form of the argument; and supposes that to be the conclusion, which is the minor proposition. For I do not *prove,* by this way of argument, *that Alæsa is upon the same coast with Aluntium.* That I *suppose* and *premise* as known from Antoninus's Itinerary, Diodorus, and Strabo, who all describe it in that situation. Methinks a man that had a System of Logic* made and printed for his own use might have been able to reduce an argument into the form of a syllogism. My argument lies thus:

Alæsa, Himera, and Aluntium, are mentioned together in the Epistle, as sea-towns, and near one another.

But Alæsa of Archonides is a sea-town in the neighbourhood of Himera and Aluntium.

Therefore Alæsa of Archonides is the Alæsa mentioned in the Epistle.

But let us see what exploits he will do, if I *lend* him

[* By Dr. Aldrich.—D.]

the argument (p. 124). "Tully says, *Halesini, Catinenses,* "*Panormitani,* &c.; and again, *Halesini, Catinenses, Tyn-* "*daritani,* &c.[v] 'Tis evident, therefore, that Alæsa is upon "the same coast with Catana; that is, upon the coast "directly opposite to Aluntium." This he nicknames *my way of argument;* though it be just as much like it, as Planudes's picture of Æsop is like the original. When either the design of the writer, or the circumstances of the thing itself, plainly intimate that the places mentioned together are near one another, we may infer that they are so: as, first, I know from the design of the writers (because Strabo and Antoninus mention the towns in order) that Alæsa of Archonides is in the neighbourhood of Himera; and again, I know that Alæsa in the Epistle is supposed in the neighbourhood of Himera, from the circumstances of the action. But what is there like these in the passage of Cicero? All Sicily had been pillaged by Verres, and there were people from all the towns to inform against him at Rome: now Cicero was not obliged, like a geographer, to mention each of them according to their situation, but rather according to the quality and wealth of the people.

But who is this that makes all this controversy about Alæsa in the Epistle? Is this the same Mr. Boyle that was the Editor of these *Epistles?* So he gives himself out to be: and yet that Editor has described this Alæsa in the Epistle to be the very same that I say it is. For he says,[w] *Alæsa is a sea-port town on the west side of the island. Cic. in Verrem,* III. Now this situation agrees with no other than the Alæsa of Archonides; and we are sure Cicero meant that very town, from those words of Diodorus,[x] *That the Romans gave to Alæsa of Archonides an immunity from paying taxes,* compared with these of Cicero,[y] *Centuripa and*

[v] Cic. ii. in Verrem.

[w] Index Phal. Alæsa .... Cic. in Verr. iii. Maritima est in occidentaliori insulæ latere. And again, Aluntium, ... non procul ab Alæsâ.

[x] Διὰ τὴν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων δοθεῖσαν ἀτέλειαν. Diod. p. 246.

[y] Immunes civitates ac liberæ, Centuripina, Halesina, &c. iii. in Verrem.

Alæsa, free cities, and exempt from paying taxes. What shall we say to such an Examiner? He could speak the truth freely, as long as truth was not against him. But when he sees these things turned upon him, to expose his admired author, and pull down the honour of his Edition, then he reverses his own judgments, and what was white before, must now be black. But perhaps some white may turn red, when the Examiner pleases to reflect upon these self-contradictions.

To shew his talent once more at misrepresenting; he repeats another argument of mine thus: *Alæsa of Archonides must be meant in the Epistles, because there was no other town of that name in the days of the Sophist* (p. 124). Now in those words of mine that he refers to, there is nothing like *because;* neither are they brought there as an argument to prove what he says they are. After I had fully proved, that the writer of the *Epistles* meant Archonides's Alæsa, I concluded with this, *And indeed there was no other town of that name in the days of the Sophist.* Which I did not design for a separate argument; for that would plainly suppose the thing in question, that the *Epistles* were writ by a Sophist. But I added them only as an account *à priori*, how it came about that the Sophist should mention that Alæsa. And the account I take to be good and rational, that no other Alæsa was heard of in the days of the Sophist.

The very design, then, of this period is misrepresented by the Examiner; but he is mistaken, too, incidentally, as he dresses up his inference. *We find,* says he, *in these Epistles the names of Astypalæa, Himera, Zancle, towns out of date long before the days of the Sophist* (p. 125). If Mr. B. means Astypalæa[z] a city of Crete, where he fancies Phalaris was born, I can readily agree with him, that that town was quite out of date both before and after the days of the Sophist, till Phalaris's Editors first found it out. *But Mr. B. forgets that he is disputing with a strange sort of people, who won't*

[z] Phal. edit. Oxon.

allow (p. 125) that Astypalæa in the *Epistles* is a town of Crete, but a city and island in the Ægean sea; which city, they believe, was not out of date in the days of the Sophist; for it was standing in Tiberius's[a] and Titus's[b] time, and, for aught Mr. B. or I know, many centuries after. But grant it only as low as Titus: I believe the author of Phalaris's *Epistles* might live before that time; for I find the forged Letters of Euripides were extant in Tiberius's days. And I can allow the same antiquity to the counterfeit Phalaris. 'Tis a query, therefore, whether I do not think him older than the Examiner himself does?

I would sum up the particulars of this second head, if the Examiner's performance could bear recapitulating. But it's too thin and tender to endure handling again. I refer it all to the readers, and let it stand or fall by the judgment of that jury.

III.

The LXX. Epistle gives an account of several rich presents to Polyclitus the Messenian physician, for doing a great cure upon Phalaris. Among the rest he names ποτηρίων Θηρικλείων ζεύγη δέκα, *ten couple of Thericlean cups.* But there is another thing, besides a pretty invention, very useful to a liar; and that is, a good memory. For we will suppose our author to have once known something of these cups, the time and the reason they were first called so; but he had unhappily forgot it when he writ this Epistle. They were large drinking cups, of a peculiar shape, so called from the first contriver of them, one Thericles, a Corinthian potter. Pliny,[c] by mistaking his author

[a] Strabo, p. 488. [b] Plin. iv. 23.

[c] Lib. xvi. cap. 40. Celebratur et Thericles nomine, calices ex terebintho solitus facere torno.

Theophrastus, makes him a turner. The words of Theophrastus are these: Τορνεύεσθαι δ' ἐξ αὐτῆς (τερμίνθου) κύλικας Θηρικλείους, ὥστε μηδ' ἂν ἕνα διαγνῶναι πρὸς τὰς κεραμέας; *That the turners make Thericlean cups of the turpentine tree, which cannot be distinguished from those made by the potters.*[d] [T]here can nothing be gathered hence to make Thericles himself a turner; for, after he had first invented them, they were called *Thericlean* from their shape, whatsoever artificer made them, and whether of earth, or of wood, or of metal. But, as I said, by the general consent of writers, we must call him a potter. Hesychius, Θηρίκλειος, κύλικος εἶδος ἀπὸ Θηρικλέους κεραμέως. Lucian,[e] Καὶ γηγενῆ πολλὰ, οἷα Θηρικλῆς ὤπτα. Etymologicon M., Θηρίκλειον κύλικα, ... ἣν λέγουσι, πρῶτος κεραμεὺς Θηρικλῆς ἐποίησεν, ὥς φησιν Εὔβουλος, ὁ τῆς μέσης κωμῳδίας ποιητής. The words of Eubulus, whom he cites, are extant in Athenæus,[f]

> Καθαρώτερον γὰρ τὸν κέραμον εἰργαζόμην
> Ἡ Θηρικλῆς τὰς κύλικας, ἡνίκ' ἦν νέος.

And again,

> Ὦ γαῖα κεραμῖτ', ἥ σε Θηρικλῆς ποτε
> Ἔτευξε, κοίλης λαγόνος εὐρύνας βάθος.

Now, the next thing to be inquired, is the age of this Thericles; and we learn that from Athenæus; one witness indeed, but as good as a multitude in a matter of this nature. *This cup*, says he, *was invented by Thericles the Corinthian potter, who was contem-*

[d] Hi. Plant. l. v. cap. 4. [e] In Lexiphane, p. 960.

[f] Lib. xi. p. 471. [= IV. 244, 245. *ed. Schw.*, where in the second passage κεραμῖτι, ὁ σὲ.—D.]

porary with Aristophanes the comedian.[g] And, in all probability, he had this indication from some fable of that poet's now lost, where that Corinthian was mentioned as one then alive. But all the plays that we have left of his are known to have been written and acted between the LXXXIIX.* and XCVII. Olympiads, which is an interval of XXXVI. years. Take now the very first year of that number; and Thericles, with the cups that had their appellation from him, come above CXX. years after Phalaris's death.

But I must remove one objection that may be made against the force of this argument; for some ancient grammarians give a quite different account why such cups were called *Thericlean.* Some derive the word Θηρίκλειος, ἀπὸ τῶν θηρίων, *from the skins of beasts that were figured upon them:* and Pamphilus the Alexandrian would have them called so, ἀπὸ τοῦ θῆρας κλονεῖν, *because beasts were scared and frightened, when, in sacrifices, wine was poured upon them out of those cups.* So I interpret the words of Pamphilus; ἀπὸ τοῦ τὸν Διόνυσον τοὺς θῆρας κλονεῖν, σπένδοντα ταῖς κύλιξι ταύταις κατ' αὐτῶν.[h] For what is more ordinary in old authors than the memory of that custom of pouring wine on the heads of victims?

Ipsa, tenens dextrâ pateram, pulcherrima Dido,
Candentis vaccæ media inter cornua fudit.
[Virg. *Æn.* iv. 60.]

Nor are wild beasts only called θῆρες, but tame too, such as bulls and cows; as the Epigrammatist

[g] Pag. 470. [=IV. 241. *ed. Schw.*—D.] Κατασκευάσαι λέγεται τὴν κύλικα ταύτην Θηρικλῆς ὁ Κορίνθιος κεραμεὺς . . . . γεγονὼς τοῖς χρόνοις κατὰ τὸν κωμικὸν Ἀριστοφάνη. [* =LXXXVIII.—D.]

[h] Athenæus, p. 471. [=IV. 243. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

calls the Minotaur *ἄνθρωπον μιξοθῆρα.* * I cannot therefore comprehend why the most learned Is. Casaubon would read *σπεύδοντα* in this passage, and not *σπένδοντα.* For, I own, I see little or no sense in it according to his lection. And as for the authority of the ancient Epitomiser of Athenæus, who, he says, reads it *σπεύδοντα,* one may be certain 'twas a literal fault in that copy of him that Casaubon used. For Eustathius, who appears never to have seen the true Athenæus, but only that Epitome, reads it in his book *σπένδοντα,* and took it in the same sense that I now interpret it, Ἢ *διότι θῆρας κλονεῖ, σπένδουσι γὰρ κατ' αὐτῶν κύλιξι τοιαύταις.*[i]

And now for these two derivations of the word *Θηρίκλειος*; was ever any thing so forced, so frigid, so unworthy of refutation? Does not common analogy plainly shew, that as from *Ἡρακλῆς* comes *Ἡράκλειος,* from *Σοφοκλῆς, Σοφόκλειος,* and many such like; so *Θηρίκλειος* must be from *Θηρικλῆς*? besides so many express authorities for it, which I have cited before. To which I may add that of Julius Pollux,[k] *Θηρίκλειον καὶ Κάνθαρον ἀπὸ τῶν ποιησάντων*: and Plutarch in P. Æmilius,[l] *Οἵ τε τὰς Ἀντιγονίδας, καὶ Σελευκίδας, καὶ Θηρικλείους . . . ἐπιδεικνύμενοι:* and Clemens Alexand., *Ἐρρέτων τοίνυν Θηρίκλειοί τινες κύλικες, καὶ Ἀντιγονίδες, καὶ Κάνθαροι.*† For one may justly infer, that both Plutarch and Clemens believed *Θηρίκλειοι* to be from *Θηρικλῆς*; because they join them with those other cups, all which had their names from men that either invented or used them. And so says a manuscript note upon

[* *Ep. adesp., Anth. Gr. ex rec. Br.* (*ed. Jacobs.*), iv. 180.—D.]
[i] P. 1209. Iliad. [*ed. Basil.*—D.]
[k] Lib. vi. c. 16.
[l] P. 273.
[† *Pæd.* ii. 3. p. 188. *ed. Pott.*—D.]

that passage of Clemens; *Θηρίκλειοι ἀπὸ Θηρικλέους τοῦ ἐφευρόντος.* So that, upon the whole, let Pamphilus and those other grammarians help him as they can, our Sophist stands fully convicted, upon this indictment, of forgery and imposture.

The Examiner has been frugal and sparing of his learning upon the former topics, that he might lay it out more profusely upon this third; at the same time that his friend Phalaris was exercising his liberality upon his physician Polyclitus.

And first he endeavours to cut the knot, that he may save the hard labour of loosing it. The text of Phalaris, as it stands now, is, *Καὶ ποτηρίων Θηρικλείων ζεύγη δέκα. What,* says he, *if it was heretofore, Ποτηρίων δ' Ἡρακλείων, Heraclean or Herculean cups, instead of Thericlean; 'tis a very inconsiderable alteration, and yet it salves all* (p. 146). I agree with Mr. B., that this alteration of his is every way *very inconsiderable.* I won't contend with him about the unreasonable license he takes in changing a plain reading against the authority of three MSS. and the whole set of editions, purely to serve a turn. Another man perhaps would have disputed it; but I am willing to encourage criticism in every well-wisher. The only exception that I'll now make against his emendation is this, That there never was any sort or fashion of cups that were called *Herculean.*

'Tis true, Athenæus in his catalogue of cups reckons the *Herculean, Ἡράκλειον*; but he meant not that it was a species of cups of such a shape, so denominated from Hercules, but it was one single cup, that Hercules made use of on a particular occasion. He tells us,[m] from Pisander, Panyasis, and Pherecydes, that when Hercules designed to go to Erythea, an isle in the western ocean, he forced the Sun to lend him his cup that he uses to sail in from west to

[m] Athen. p. 469. [= IV. 237. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

east every night; and in that cup he passed over to Erythea. And he proves further, out of Stesichorus, Antimachus, and Æschylus, that there was such a fabulous tradition about the Sun's sailing over the ocean every night in a cup.[n] Apollodorus tells the same story,[o] that the Sun lent Hercules his *golden cup* to sail in. *Antiqua historia est*, says Macrobius, *Herculem poculo, tanquam navigio, vectum immensa maria transisse*. The vulgar editions read it *ventis*, instead of *vectum*.[p] *'Tis an old story, that Hercules passed over the sea in a cup, as if it had been a ship.* And he names his authors, the same that Athenæus quotes, Panyasis and Pherecydes. But Athenæus adds, that, according to Mimnermus, 'tis a *golden bed*,[q] and not a cup, that the Sun uses to sail in; nay, that if we believe the author of *Titanomachia*, and one Theoclytus, 'tis a *cauldron*.[r] And thence it is that Alexander Ephesius says, Hercules sailed to Erythea in a *brazen cauldron*,[s]

Χαλκείῳ δὲ λέβητι μέγαν διενήξατο πόντον.

And so say Servius[t] and Albricus:[u] but Euphorion denies this, and calls it a *brazen ship*,[v]

Χαλκείῃ ἀκάτῳ βουπληθέος ἐξ Ἐρυθείης,

if *ἄκατος* in this place do not signify a cup in the fashion of a ship. Now, upon the whole, I conceive 'tis most evident that the *Herculean* was one single particular cup, used once only by Hercules upon extraordinary service; not imitated and multiplied into a sort or fashion, so as x.* pair of such cups might be presented by Phalaris. 'Twas so far from being a vulgar cup for domestic uses, that, as we have seen above, 'tis not known among writers what shape or fashion

[n] *Φιάλη, δέπας.* [o] Apoll. lib. ii. p. 115. [p] Macrob. Saturn. v. 21.
[q] *Εὐνὴ χρυσῆ.* [r] *Λέβης.* [s] Eustath. ad Dionys.
[t] Servius ad Æn. vii. [u] Albr. xxii.
[v] Athen. Fragm. Casaub. p. 782. [There seems to be some mistake in the reference. Both the lines quoted above are found in *Eustath. ad Dionys. Per.*, p. 217. ed. 1697.—D.]

[* Old ed. "xx."—D.]

it was of, nor indeed whether it was a cup or no. This explication of Athenæus will perhaps seem new to our Examiner; but he'll be satisfied 'tis the true one, if he pleases to take that author, whom he has abused and reviled so much, once more into his hand. Or, if authority goes further with him than bare reason, I have Eustathius to vouch for it, who, after he has set down this very passage of Athenæus, I mean out of his Epitome, concludes thus; *So that the Herculean cup is that which is called also the Sun's cup.*[w]

In the same manner Athenæus puts *Νεστορὶς, the Nestorean,* in his catalogue of cups; not that there were a sort of cups of that name and fashion, but it was a particular cup of Nestor's described by Homer,[x]

> *Πὰρ δὲ δέπας περικαλλὲς, ὃ οἴκοθεν ἦγ' ὁ γεραιὸς,*
> *Χρυσείοις ἥλοισι πεπαρμένον,* &c.

There were many disputes among the old grammarians about the shape of this cup, which they gathered from Homer's account of it, and many treatises were written upon the subject; which is a sure indication that it was not in common use. Dionysius Thrax,[y] a grammarian of great note, to shew his scholars the figure of it by a more sensible way than a verbal description, got a workman to make one in silver according to his directions, the metal being provided at the charge of his scholars. This, I presume, will convince the Examiner, that no such cups, called *Nestorean,* were then in fashion. And, in truth, the *Ἡράκλειον* and the *Νεστορὶς* were words never heard of but out of the mouths of grammarians. Athenæus therefore has not brought one single author that used either of those names; nor has Pollux made any mention of them in his chapters *of Cups.*

But, Mr. B. will say, *are not Heraclean cups mentioned in Cicero among the wealth of Verres, which he had amassed*

[w] Eust. ad Odys. p. 359. [*ed. Basil.*—D.] Διὸ καὶ Ἡράκλειον δέπας λέγεσθαι, τὸ καὶ Ἡλίου.

[x] Il. Λ. v. 631.

[y] Athen. 469. [=IV. 313. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

together out of Sicily, the very place where the scene of these Letters lay? (p. 146, ed. 2.) His words are, *Pocula duo quædam, quæ Heraclea nominantur.*[z] This passage our Examiner met with in Salmasius's notes upon Solinus; and, perceiving that that great man did not approve this vulgar lection, he thus animadverts upon him: *Salmasius,* says he, *will not allow the present reading of* Heraclea; *but, like a true critic, without any authority, substitutes* Thericlea *in the room of it* (p. 147). He shews what class of critics himself is in, by this little insult upon a *true* one. But by what authority does our Examiner affirm that Salmasius did it *without any authority?* If he had but cast his eyes upon the most common editions of Cicero, he would have seen there that two MS. copies have it *Theridia,* and another *et heridia;* which a man of the smallest acquaintance with books will easily know to be for *Thericlia; d* being put for *cl* in infinite places. And before Salmasius was born, this same correction was started by Gul. Canterus;[a] who says, some persons affirmed that the MSS. have it expressly *Thericlea.* Here, I suppose, is sufficient authority for substituting this reading. But the best authority is what I have newly laid before him, that there were no such cups called *Heraclean.* And if Cicero had meant such, he would have called them not *Heraclean,* but *Herculean.*

But Athenæus talks of a σκύφος Ἡρακλεωτικὸς,[b] which the Examiner would interpret *an Heraclean or Herculean bowl* (p. 146). This objection, therefore, must be removed; and it will be done very easily. *Some,* says Athenæus, *call this bowl Heracleotic, from Hercules, who first used this sort in his expeditions.*[c] His way is, to set down the several opinions, though they be false and absurd; as the ridiculous derivation of *Thericlean* cups from θηρίων or θῆρας κλονεῖν;

[z] Cic. iv. in Verrem.

[a] Canterus, Nov. Lect. v. 28. Nam in scriptis quidem libris Thericlea se reperisse sunt qui asserunt.

[b] Athen. apud Casaub. 782. [=IV. 215. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

[c] P. 500. [=IV. 356. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

which we have spoken of above. And thus he has imparted to us that etymology of *Heracleotic*, though it be against all rules of analogy. But he has sufficiently intimated his own opinion, that they are called so from Heraclea, the town of their manufacture; and for the same reason they are called also *Bœotic*, because this Heraclea was in or near Bœotia. 'Tis true, these cups had *the Herculean knot*[d] wrought upon the ears of them; yet that did not give them their name: but it was put there, because Heraclea, the town where the cups were made, had its original and name from Hercules. For this was Heraclea Trachin,[e] situate near the foot of Oëta, where Hercules was burnt. These bowls, therefore, were called *Heracleotic* from the place of their manufacture; as others upon the same account were called *Rhodian, Syracusian, Chalcidic, Λυκιουργεῖς*. So there were *Heracleotic nuts, Heracleotic crab-fish*, so called from another Heraclea, a city of Pontus.

Our Examiner being thus baffled in his alteration of Phalaris's text, he now resolves to turn about, and try to maintain it as it now stands. Athenæus affirms that Thericles lived in Aristophanes's time: *and he*, said I, *in a case of history and philology, is a witness as good as a multitude* (p. 147). The Examiner endeavours to ridicule the very expression, as far as his puerile jests can help him out. But methinks he might have remembered his Homer;[f]

Ἰητρὸς γὰρ ἀνὴρ πολλῶν ἀντάξιος ἄλλων.

Or that epigram upon Heraclitus;[g]

Εἷς ἐμοὶ ἄνθρωπος τρισμύριοι—

One man to me is as good as 30000. Or the saying of Anti-

[d] Ἡράκλειος δεσμός.

[e] See Athen. p. 500 and 461. [=IV. 356, 193. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

[f] Iliad. A. [514.—D.]

[g] Anthol. iii. [=IV. 226. *ed. Jacobs. ex rec. Br.*; I. 342. *Anth. Gr. ad fid. Cod. Pal.*—D.]

machus, *Plato mihi unus est instar multorum millium.*[h] But, for fear he should fall foul upon these authors, as he has upon Manilius, and Laërtius, and others (p. 26, 28, &c.), because he thought I had an esteem for them, I'll give him his own *favourite author Phalaris* (p. 32), who thus compliments one Epicharmus, *One such man as you is as much to me as all Sicily is.*[i]

The two next pages are spent in a *tedious, insipid* declamation (they are his own words to a better writer, Dion Chrysostom) about Athenæus's not citing his authors to shew the age of Thericles. The short of his speech is this, That he won't take Athenæus's word for a single farthing, unless he get somebody to be bound for him. But there is one stroke in it, of a more subtle turn than the rest, that shews the wonderful sagacity of our Examiner. Athenæus had made this Thericles contemporary with Aristophanes the poet. This, says the Examiner, he had no downright witness of, but only he had never read, or did not then call to mind, any older author that spoke of him. *For observable it is,* (yes, I pray you, Sirs, observe it,) *that among the several quotations, in which he abounds on this head, there is none that runs higher than the age of that poet* (p. 149). Now certainly there was never such a sharp-sighted observator, since the famous Lynceus saw through a mill-stone. Athenæus, when he enters upon this head, expressly declares that this Thericles lived in Aristophanes's time; and yet *observable it is* that he quotes nobody that mentions him before Aristophanes's time. Now, in my opinion, it had been much more *observable,* if he *had* produced any testimony before the time of Aristophanes. For that would have been as flat a contradiction to what he had newly delivered, as our Examiner's contradictions are to what the Editor of Phalaris says.

But, since Athenæus has so little credit with Mr. B. that he won't believe a word he says, without a voucher,

[h] Cic. in Bruto.

[i] Ep. 98. Εἷς ἀνὴρ ἐμοὶ τοιοῦτος ἁπάσης ἐστι Σικελίας μέτρον.

I'll endeavour to produce a witness for him, Eubulus the comic poet:

> *Διένιψα δ' οὐδὲν σκεῦος οὐδεπώποτε,*
> *Καθαρώτερον γὰρ τὸν κέραμον εἰργαζόμην*
> *Ἢ Θηρικλῆς τὰς κύλικας, ἡνίκ' ἦν νέος.*

I made, says he, *the earthenware purer than Thericles did his cups, when he was young.*[j] Those that know style and language will agree with me, that the last words, *ἡνίκ' ἦν νέος*, must be referred to Thericles; and not be rendered in the first person, as the Latin translator has mistaken them. And I take them to be an intimation that Thericles was alive when this play was acted, and that he was old then and past his work. This, I dare say, is the best and neatest explication that can be put upon the words, and therefore I believe it the truest. For if Thericles had been long dead before the age of Eubulus (so long as to be older than Phalaris), the poet would not have added those words, *when he was young*. For how could he know then, that Thericles lived so long that he left off his trade, or at least did not work at it with his own hands, as the words imply? Thericles therefore, by this account, was an old man in the time of Eubulus, and flourished *κατὰ τὸν Ἀριστοφάνη*, in Aristophanes's days. And this is remarkably confirmed by the testimony of chronology. For Eubulus lived Olymp. CI.[k] in the middle interval between the old and the new comedy; and *Plutus*, the last of Aristophanes's plays, was acted Olymp. XCVII. 4.,[l] which is about X. years before. So that the same man might be in his prime in Aristophanes's time, and decrepit in Eubulus's.

The Examiner has been so perpetually mistaken since his very first setting out, that I could wish, for a little variety, he would be once in the right. But I find he won't oblige me yet; for he falls into a new error in the very

[j] Athen. 471. [= IV. 244. *ed. Schw.*—D.]
[k] Suid. v. Εὔβουλος.
[l] Schol. Vet. ad Plutum.

next paragraph. Athenæus's words are, *One Thericles, who lived about the time of Aristophanes, is said* (or *is reported*) *to have made this sort of cup.*[m] 'Tis the Examiner's own translation: and he makes this observation upon the place; *That the author says,* λέγεται, is said, is reported; *which is an expression of distrust, and that he was not satisfied of the truth of the report.* Now, to what purpose our Examiner remarked this, it's hard to understand. For that Thericles lived in Aristophanes's time, Athenæus speaks *positively,* witness Mr. B.'s own version of his words. And this is all we depended on Athenæus's credit for; for as to the other point, that Thericles invented the cups, we have ten witnesses at least, besides Athenæus. What service, then, can he do his cause from this λέγεται, though it really signified such a distrust? But this fancied *distrust* is another error, of near affinity to the former. For λέγεται is so far from being a token of want of evidence, that it is principally used upon the contrary account, when the generality of writers are agreed. When a single witness says a thing, he is commonly mentioned by name; but when the evidence is numerous, and cannot all be brought in, then they say λέγεται, or φασί. Even this passage under debate might have given the hint to the Examiner; for, after our author had said λέγεται, he brings three witnesses to that very point. But I'll give him an instance of another writer. *Λέγεται, 'tis said,* says Laërtius, *that as Pythagoras chanced to shew his thigh naked, it appeared to be gold.*[n] The reason why he says λέγεται here, when in other places he names his author, is not the want of witnesses, but the abundance of them; so that 'twas needless to name particulars. And that this is true, it manifestly appears from the many writers yet extant that affirm the same story; Apollonius, Plutarch, Lucian, Ælian, Porphyry, Jamblichus, Ammianus, &c. Again says

[m] Athen. 470. [=IV. 241. *ed. Schw.*—D.] Κατασκευάσαι δὲ λέγεται τὴν κύλικα ταύτην Θηρικλῆς, . . . γεγονὼς τοῖς χρόνοις κατὰ τὸν . . . . Ἀριστοφάνη.

[n] Laërt. in Pythag. Λέγεται δὲ αὐτοῦ ποτὲ παραγυμνωθέντος τὸν μηρὸν ὀφθῆναι χρυσοῦν.

Laërtius λέγεται, *Pythagoras is said to have advised his scholars to say this verse every day when they came home,*[o]

Πῇ παρέβην, τί δ' ἔρεξα, τί μοι δέον οὐκ ἐτελέσθη;

Now, the authors that say the same thing, the writer of the *Golden Verses*, Cicero, Porphyry, St. Hierom, are a full proof that this λέγεται does not here import a defect of proof, but rather a superfluity of it.

I had said, *common analogy plainly shews, that as from Ἡρακλῆς comes Ἡράκλειος, from Σοφοκλῆς, Σοφόκλειος, and many such like; so Θηρίκλειος must be from Θηρικλῆς.* The Examiner acknowledges the derivation is true; but the argument, he says, is stark naught. *For, let us try it,* says he, *in another instance. As from Ἀπελλῆς comes Ἀπέλλειος, so from Θαλῆς the philosopher must come Θάλειος, virens* (p.151). Now, with the leave of our pert Examiner, this *instance* of his is no instance at all. For the analogy that I spoke of does not extend to all words that have termination in ης, but only to the compound words ending in κλῆς, from κλέος, *gloria:* as, besides the words I named before, *Βαθυκλῆς, Βαθύκλειος; Ξενοκλῆς, Ξενόκλειος; Διοκλῆς, Διόκλειος;* and so *Φιλοκλῆς, Λαμπροκλῆς, Μεγακλῆς, Θεμιστοκλῆς,* &c. all form their adjectives in κλειος. Now, let him give one single instance, if he can, of a word ending in κλειος that does not follow this analogy; and then his boyish witticisms and doggrel rhymes, which he has spurted here, will come in more seasonably. But at present he only exposes himself, by breaking his unmannerly jests upon his own mistakes.

But let Athenæus be as positive as he will that Thericles and Aristophanes were contemporaries, Mr. B. will confute him out of his own words, *Καὶ μήποτε Ἄλεξις ἐν Ἡσιόνῃ Θηρικλείῳ ποιεῖ τὸν Ἡρακλέα πίνοντα;*[p] which he translates, *And does not Alexis introduce Hercules drinking out of a Thericlean cup?* Now, our Examiner has committed a

[o] Laërt. ibid.

[p] Athen. p. 470. [=IV. 241. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

double error about this one sentence. First, he has not construed the words right; for *μήποτε* is not in this place a particle of interrogation, which is the most positive way of affirming, but, on the very contrary, 'tis a word of doubting, *fortasse, perhaps,* or *it may be, that Alexis introduces.* This the Examiner might have learnt in those very Dictionaries that he talks so much of; or in Budæus's Commentaries,[q] where several passages of Athenæus himself are cited to prove it. And indeed Athenæus could not be positive that Alexis meant the Thericlean cup; for the poet's words are only these, as they now stand;

———*Γενόμενος δ' εὔνους μόλις,*
*Ἤιτησε κύλην, καὶ λαβὼν, ἑξῆς πυκνὰς**
Ἕλκει.——

But the true reading of them is rather thus;

———*Γενόμενος δ' ἔννους μόλις*
Ἤιτησε κύλικα.

But at last, coming to himself, he called for a cup of wine. The very words *γενόμενος* and *μόλις* confirm the conjecture about *ἔννους*; for so Plutarch, *Τότε δὲ ἔννους γενόμενος*; and an author in Suidas,[r] *Ὕστερον ἔννους ἐγένετο.* And the last syllable in *κύλικα* was lost, because *καὶ* followed it. And so much by way of emendation. But, as I said, Athenæus could not be *positive,* for the whole stress lay upon the word *κύλικα.* Alexis, says he, introduces Hercules drinking in a *chalice;* and perhaps he meant the *Thericlean. For that the Thericlean was a* chalice, *Theophrastus is a plain witness.*[s] These are the very next words; and this is the true sense of that passage.

[q] P. 910.

[* "Scribendum . . . . *συχνὰς.*" Toup *in Suid.* I. 26. On these emendations of the passage see Schw. VI. (*Anim.*) 94.—D.]

[r] Suid. v. *Ἔννους.*

[s] *Ὅτι δὲ κύλιξ ἐστι Θηρίκλειος, σαφῶς παρίστησι Θεόφραστος.* [*ἐστὶν ἡ Θηρίκλειος.* IV. 241. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

But, says Mr. B., *if Athenæus could suppose that Hercules and a Thericlean cup were brought upon the stage together, he must suppose too that the Thericlean cup was as ancient as Hercules, or else it would have been absurd and ridiculous* (p. 152). Here's the second mistake of our Examiner; for Athenæus knew very well that the writers of the Greek comedies did not tie themselves so strictly to the rules of chronology. He might have a thousand instances of it, which we cannot now come at. But there are enough yet extant to make the Examiner repent his rashness in taxing so great an author. Anaxandrides, in a play called *Hercules* (because Hercules was the chief person brought in upon the stage), mentions Argas the musician, who was alive when the play was acted.[t] The same poet, in another play, called *Protesilaus*, from the hero of that name that was slain by Hector, speaks of the same Argas, and Antigenidas, and Cephisodotus, three musicians, and Iphicrates the Athenian general, and Cotys king of Thrace; all of them then living in the poet's own time.[u] Diphilus the comedian in his *Sappho* introduced Archilochus and Hipponax as gallants to that lady; though one of them was dead before she was born, and she dead before the other was born.[v] Nay, Alexis himself, in his *Linus*, brings Linus upon the stage instructing his pupil Hercules, and offering him books to choose of;[w]

> Ὀρφεὺς ἔνεστιν, Ἡσίοδος, τραγῳδίαι,
> Χοίριλος, Ὅμηρος, Ἐπίχαρμος, συγγράμματα
> Παντοδαπά———

Orpheus, Hesiod, tragedies, Chœrilus, Homer, Epicharmus, and all sorts of authors; but Hercules makes choice of one Simon's* *Art of Cookery*. Can we desire an instance more apposite, and more full against our Examiner? Here's the

[t] Athen. 638. [=V. 316. *ed. Schw.*—D.]
[u] Athen. 131. [=II. 14. *ed. Schw.*—D.]
[v] Athen. 599. [=V. 169. *ed. Schw.*—D.]
[w] Athen. 164. [=II. 138. *ed. Schw.*—D.]
[* *Simus*; Gr. Σιμὸς.—D.]

same poet Alexis brings the same person Hercules with Epicharmus in his hand: and why might he not as well introduce him with a Thericlean cup in his hand?

But, besides all this, had we no such examples of this liberty of the Greek comedians, we could still defend Athenæus against the insults of our Examiner. For he forgets that Hercules was a god, and consequently, in the poet's creed, he eat and drunk even in Thericles's time. And had not Hercules several temples? and were not cups frequently among the donaries presented to the gods? Nay, the Thericlean are expressly mentioned as donaries in the Acropolis at Athens.[x] Hercules, therefore, might have several Thericleans among his own plate. For what present could be more proper to such a fuddler as he was, than a Thericlean, one of the biggest fashions of cups, some of them holding above seven *cotylæ*, that is five of our pints?[y]

Nay, allow that Hercules was a hero only, and no god; even the heroes too might be introduced drinking in Thericles's ware. For they also had their temples and donaries, and they passed their time merrily, eating and drinking; and the mischief they were supposed to do (for they were thought to be very quarrelsome and dangerous) was attributed to their being so often in drink.[z] But Hercules was particularly, and of them all the most, addicted to the juice of the grape.[a] So that he was commonly painted with his cup, and sometimes reeling and tumbling.

But our Examiner makes yet another assault against Athenæus (p. 153). That author had said, Thericles was a Corinthian potter; but Mr. B. will prove from his own words (which Athenæus's dulness did not suffer him to understand), that he was an Athenian potter, if that invention was truly his. Lynceus Samius says, Ῥοδίους ἀντιδη-

[x] Polemon apud Athen. p. 472. [=IV. 247. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

[y] Athen. 472. [=IV. 249. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

[z] Athen. 46. [461?—D.] Zenob. Οἱ γὰρ ἥρωες κακοῦν ἕτοιμοι, μᾶλλον ἢ εὐεργετεῖν.

[a] Macrob. Saturn. v. 21.

μιουργήσασθαι (*τὰς Ἡδυποτίδας*) *πρὸς τὰς Ἀθήνησι Θηρικλείους, That the Rhodians wrought a sort of cup, called* Hedypotides, *in imitation of the Thericlean, made at Athens.*[b] So Mr. B. translates it; but erroneously, as his manner is. For *ἀντιδημιουργήσασθαι* is not to work *in imitation*, but *in opposition*. Now, what will he infer from hence? That the Thericlean cups were invented at Athens? But the words do not imply it, but only that they were in great use and fashion at Athens when Lynceus wrote this discourse, that is, a hundred years after Thericles's death. Now, the cups might be invented at Corinth; but, because they took mightily at Athens, they might afterwards be the best wrought there, and so be accounted an Athenian manufacture. But let us grant they were invented at Athens; must Thericles therefore be an Athenian? A very precarious consequence. For he might be a Corinthian born, and yet be settled at Athens. For near half of the inhabitants there were strangers from other places; and the strangers[c] were commonly such as wrought in the manufactures.[d] In Demetrius Phalereus's time,[e] when the citizens were 21000, the *μέτοικοι*, strangers, were 10000. And where now is the *inconsistency and confusion* (p. 154), that our modest Examiner charges upon Athenæus? *Has he not reason to make the itch of opposing great names upon very slight or no grounds, a chief and distinguishing mark of pedantry?* (p. 157.)

The Examiner will still hang upon the cause; and if we will but allow him that Thericles was an Athenian, he has found a very surprising salvo to bring off the *Epistles*. "For then, perhaps, this Thericles was no potter, but the "Athenian Archon of that name, Olymp. LXI. 4.; and "the cups might take their name from him, because he "first used them, as the *Ἀντιγονίδαι* and *Σελευκίδαι*, men-

[b] Athen. p. 469. [=IV. 236. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

[c] Xenophon. *Περὶ πόρων.*

[d] So Plutarch in his life of Solon. *Γενέσθαι πολίταις οὐ δίδωσι πλὴν τοῖς φεύγουσιν, [ἐπ'] ἀειφυγίᾳ τὴν ἀυτῶν, ἢ πανεστίοις Ἀθήναζε μετοικιζομένοις ἐπὶ τέχνῃ.*

[e] Athen. p. 272. [=II. 543. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

" tioned in Plutarch, were so called from Antigonus and " Seleucus, who delighted in those fashions. And then, " if Phalaris lived till Olymp. LXXII. 3. (as Mr. Dodwell's " opinion is), the *Epistles* may be an original still; for, " by this account, the name might be given to the The- " riclean cups above XL. years before Phalaris's death" (p. 153). What a parcel of suppositions are here, one in the neck of another! If *Thericles was an Athenian*, which a good author assures us he was not, *then he might not be a workman, but a magistrate;* though no fewer than ten witnesses say expressly he was a workman; Pliny, Hesychius, Lucian, Etymologicon M., Scholion upon Clemens Alex., Pollux, Athenæus, Cleanthes, Theopompus, Eubulus; not one single evidence appearing against them. But suppose him to be a magistrate; *then suppose, too, that Mr. D.'s notion is true;* but I have already considered that learned man's opinion; and Eusebius's computation is still as firm as ever. What a sorry, crippled argument's here, even lame upon all four! But there's a worse distemper in it still, either to be laughed at or pitied; I mean, that wretched and scandalous barbarism of Ἀντιγονίδαι and Σελευκίδαι. The words of Plutarch, which I had cited in my *Dissertation*, are, Οἵ τε τὰς Ἀντιγονίδας καὶ Σελευκίδας καὶ Θηρικλείους ἐπιδεικνύμενοι; which the Examiner having occasion to put into the nominative case, calls them Ἀντιγονίδαι and Σελευκίδαι (in both his editions), as if the nominatives singular were Ἀντιγονίδης and Σελευκίδης. The man that has a controversy with Mr. B. must do the office of a schoolmaster, and teach him his declensions; for the cups are not to be called Ἀντιγονίδαι and Σελευκίδαι, but Ἀντιγονίδες and Σελευκίδες, from Ἀντιγονὶς and Σελευκίς. So Clemens Alex., Θηρίκλειοι κύλικες καὶ Ἀντιγονίδες.[f] Athenæus, Σελευκὶς, Ῥοδιὰς, Ἀντιγονίς.[g] Pollux, Σελευκίδα καὶ Ῥοδιάδα:[h] see Hesychius in Σελευκίς. Is not this now a

[f] Clem. Pædag. p. 69.

[g] Athen. p. 497, 783. [=IV. 347, 343, 222. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

[h] Pol. lib. vi. 26.

formidable writer, and born to be the terror and scourge of the Scaligers and Salmasius's? 'Tis to be hoped that henceforward he will not make so many awkward jests upon Lexicons and Dictionaries; any one of which upon this occasion might have done him good service.

The last effort, upon this topic, that Mr. B. makes for his *Sicilian prince*, is a memorandum he gives his reader, that this and all the other chronological arguments touch only those particular Epistles from whence they are taken. So that, should those Epistles be found spurious, yet the rest of the set may, *to his comfort*, be genuine. What a passionate concern's here! who can find in his heart now to deprive the gentleman *of his comfort?* I, for my part, whom he calls a man of *singular humanity*,* will reserve this point to some other section towards the end of this Book, and let him enjoy his dear comfort as long as I can.

And now, having exhibited these specimens of his learning, he takes the opportunity to shew his readers a little of his temper. *He assures them that I went no farther for* ALL *this learning about Thericlean cups than my Dictionaries, and what one of those referred me to, Casaubon's Notes on Athenæus* (p. 156). This he assured in his first Edition; but in the second he discovers that I take some part of it from Salmasius: so that there he *assures* that I went to my Dictionaries and Casaubon *for* ALMOST ALL *this learning*. (p. 156. 2d edit.) The readers, without question, will allow that the Examiner's *assurance* is *good*, that shall dare to *assure* two contrary things, and inconsistent with one another. A man that accuses at this rate answers himself. But, however, because it's such a matter of fact as I can give a direct reply to, I'll shew him that piece of respect to return him an answer. He says, I have taken some of it out of Salmasius; I answer directly, *I have not;* for I knew not then that Salmasius had said one word about it. Casaubon's Notes, I own, I had seen, and I desire the reader to

[* See note, p. i.—D.]

see them too, that he may see the spirit of the Examiner. One main branch of what I said upon this head is a refutation of Casaubon. And did I gather out of Casaubon's Notes a refutation of himself? I wish I could truly own it; for the reputation of it would be the greater. And lastly, if this learning lay so very obvious, that, as Mr. B. says, *I went no further than Dictionaries for it*, the greater is the shame for him, that, when *Phalaris* was published, he was ignorant of such a common thing; for he neither translates the word *Θηρίκλεια* right, nor appears to have had any knowledge of the original of the name.

But now the storm begins to rise higher; *and I fall*, he says, *upon Casaubon, against common gratitude, common sense, truth, decency, and reason* (p. 156, 157). The occasion of all this outcry is this; Casaubon had endeavoured to correct the text of Athenæus, and alter *σπένδοντα* into *σπεύδοντα*. But, in my *Dissertation*, I plainly shewed how that great man was mistaken; neither has the Examiner offered one word to justify his correction. What is it then that he is so incensed at? Casaubon had observed, that the MS. Epitomiser of Athenæus read it *σπεύδοντα*; *but one may be certain*, said I, *'twas a fault only in that copy of him that Casaubon used. For Eustathius, who appears never to have seen the true Athenæus, but only that Epitome, read it in his book σπένδοντα.* Here the Examiner swells and blusters (p. 157, 158, 159); and indeed I must beseech the reader to read over those pages of his; they are an original strain for civility and good manners: and yet he is all over mistaken in every paragraph of them.

It is certain, says he, *that Eustathius had seen Athenæus himself: and therefore Casaubon says only of him, that he did* OFTEN *use the Epitome.*[1] *And Dr. B. will not pretend ever to have seen it, for it's unprinted to this day: so that he talks of a thing that he knows nothing of, and can know nothing of but from Casaubon, and yet ventures to contradict him.* Now,

[1] Sæpè uti Epitome. p. 2.

to stop the Examiner a little in the career of his confidence; in the first place, that very copy of the Epitome that Casaubon used and possessed, among many other books was purchased of his executors soon after his death, and deposited in the Royal Library: and I had the Book then in my hand, and had newly consulted it (let the Examiner read this, if he can, without blushing,) when I writ this passage in my *Dissertation*. For, suspecting from those instances which Casaubon had given, that Eustathius had only used the Epitome of Athenæus, without having the original, I had the curiosity to examine near a hundred passages of Eustathius; and I perpetually found that he had taken them from the Epitome, and never from the true author. Had I not reason then to say, *That Eustathius* APPEARS *never to have seen the true Athenæus?* Half of that examination would have encouraged our Examiner into the positive style, that he had *certainly* never seen him.

For, without any grounds at all, he is positive of the contrary, though it be *a thing that he knows nothing of. It is certain*, says he, *that Eustathius had seen Athenæus himself.* Why so? and whence has he this air of assurance? Because Casaubon says, *He* OFTEN *followed the Epitome.* A very extraordinary inference; because he *often* followed the Epitome, therefore he *sometimes* followed the original. If his new System of Logic teaches him such arguments, I'll be content with the old ones. Mr. Casaubon had examined several passages of Eustathius, where he quotes Athenæus; and he cautiously says, that he *often* uses the *Excerpta;* because perhaps he had no leisure or no desire to be satisfied further. I come after him, and examine many more passages of Eustathius; and I find that he appears to have *always* followed the *Excerpta.* Both of our assertions are true, and consistent with each other. And yet the Examiner says *I contradict Casaubon* (p. 157). But I would advise him to take one lecture more in his Logic, to know what a contradiction is.

But I had said, *'Twas a fault only in that copy of the Epi-*

tome that Casaubon used. By a *fault only*, I meant, *'twas only a fault*, nothing but an error of the scribe, and a literal mistake. Here the Examiner argues against me as if I had said, *'Twas a fault in that only copy;* and he presently falls into his old vein of civil language. Now, this is just as good construction as if his own words in this very page, *and therefore Casaubon says only of Eustathius* (p. 157), should be interpreted, *that he says it of Eustathius only.* In which acceptation the thing is false. But a mistake of syntax is a small fault in our Examiner, after those great ones that have come before.

The Examiner now *begs the reader's pardon, while he wanders a moment or two from his subject* (p. 158): but I am very much mistaken, if he will not find it the greatest difficulty to *pardon* himself. In my Latin *Dissertation upon Johannes Antiochenus*,[j] I had started a new observation about the measures of the Anapæstic Verse. All the moderns before had supposed that the last syllable of every verse was common, as well in anapæsts as they are known to be in hexameters and others; so that, in poems of their own composing, the last foot of their anapæsts was very frequently a tribrachys, or a trochee, or a cretic; or the foot ended in a vowel or an *m*, while the next verse begun with a vowel or an *h*. In every one of which cases an error was committed; because there was no license allowed by the ancients to the last syllable of anapæsts; but the anapæst feet run on to the parœmiac, that is, to the end of the set, as if the whole had been a single verse. This, I said, was a general rule among the Greek poets; and even Seneca the Latin tragedian (to shew he was conscious of this rule that I have now discovered,) never ends an anapæstic verse with a cretic, as Buchanan, Scaliger, Grotius, &c. usually do; though sometimes, indeed, he does it with a trochee, but even that *very seldom*,[k] and generally at the close of a sentence.

[j] Dissert. ad Joh. Antioch. p. 26. [*ed.* 1691.—D.]

[k] Semel atque iterùm.

Even envy itself will be forced to allow, that this discovery of mine, if it be true, is no inconsiderable one. I am sure, had any man found it out before Buchanan and the rest had published their poems, he would have had their hearty thanks for preventing those flaws in them. But see the hard fate of discoverers! At last the learned Mr. Boyle arises, and roundly tells the world, which had believed me for VIII. or IX. years, *That nothing can be falser and fuller of mistake than what I have there asserted.* One would think, as he says, that a man that talks at this bold rate, *with such an air of self-sufficiency,* had need to be *perfectly sure of his point* (p. 159). And is that the case of our Examiner here? Has he *wandered from his subject* upon a sure and true scent? That the reader shall presently judge of: but I must freely own to him before-hand, that some little disdain rises within me, to see myself employed in confuting such stuff as he has brought on this occasion.

How durst you oppose, says he, *men of Grotius' and Scaliger's character with such groundless assertions? For it is usual among the Greek tragedians to end their anapæsts with a trochee or a tribrach; and Seneca has done it at least forty or fifty times, where there is no close of the sense* (p. 159). The instances he gives are five out of Æschylus, and as many out of Seneca. The first from Æschylus is,

(I.) *Τὴν Διὸς αὐλὴν εἰσοιχνεῦσι,*
Διὰ τὴν λίαν— *Prom.* v. 122.

And the IV. like it,

Τὸν δὲ χαλινοῖς ἐν πετρίνοισι
Χειμαζόμενον— v. 565. [= 578. *ed. Blom.*]

These two verses, as our Examiner imagines, are ended with trochees, the last syllable being short. Now, methinks a man of half the learning of Mr. Boyle might have known that *σι* may be long here, by adding *ν* to it before a consonant, as poets frequently do; *εἰσοιχνεῦσιν, πετρινοῖσιν.*

This very fable, that Mr. B. quotes, might have taught it him;

Ἐπαοιδαῖσι θέλξει στερεάς. v. 173. [=180. *ed. Blom.*]

Or that verse in *Supplic.*,

Ὀμβροφόροισί τ' ἀνέμοις ἀγρίας. v. 36.

Or these of Aristophan.,

Ἁλσὶ διασμηχθεὶς ὄναιτ' ἂν οὑτοσί.
Nub. [v. 1218. *ed. Bekk.*]

Ἰατρὸς ὢν καὶ μάντις, ὥς φασι, σοφός.
Plut. [v. 11. *ed. Bekk.*]

In all which places, and a hundred more that it's easy to allege, the syllable *σι* is long, as if it was pronounced *ἐπαοιδαῖσιν*, *ὀμβροφόροισιν*, *ἁλσὶν*, and *φασίν*. And these examples are all found in the middle of verses, lest the Examiner should make any exceptions if they were in the end of anapæsts.

(III.)* But he may have better success with the next passage that he produces from Æschylus;

Εἰς ἀρθμὸν ἐμοὶ καὶ φιλότητα
Σπεύδων — *Prom.* v. 191. [=199. *ed. Blom.*]

Here, too, he supposes the last foot is a trochee, because *τα* is a short syllable. But I must tell the learned Examiner, that *τα* in this place is long, because the next word *σπεύδων* begins with two consonants. There's nothing more common among the poets than this; as I will shew him out of his own author, Æschylus, and that in the middle of anapæstic verses:

Πῆμα στενάχω. πῇ ποτε μόχθων. *Prom.* v. 99.
Γένος ὠλέσατε πρυμνόθεν αὖθις.†
Sept. Theb. 1064. [=1059. *ed. Blom.*]

[* This and the two following references to Boyle's quotations from Æschylus are wrong in the old ed.—D.] [† Eds. *οὕτως*.—D.]

Οὓς πέρι πᾶσα χθὼν Ἀσιῆτις. *Pers.* 61.

Ἀλλὰ χθόνιοι δαίμονες ἁγνοί.
[*Id.*] 630. [= 634. *ed. Blom.*]

Have not *πῆμα, ὠλέσατε,* and *πᾶσα,* and *ἀλλὰ,* their last syllables long here, because two consonants follow them? Has our Examiner forgot his Virgil too?

Terrasque, tractusque maris, cœlumque profundum.
[*Georg.* iv. 222.]

Æstusque, pluviasque, et agentes frigora ventos.
[*Georg.* i. 352.]

Ferte citi flammam, date tela, scandite muros.*
[*Æn.* ix. 37.]

(V.) Another of his instances out of Æschylus is,

— *Στρόμβοι δὲ κόνιν*
Ἑιλίσσουσι— [*Prom.*] v. 1084. [=1120. *ed. Blom.*]

Where he thinks the last foot of the verse is a tribrachys, *νιν* in *κόνιν* being short. But, under favour, I say it's an anapæst, and the last of *κόνιν*† may be long. So Homer;

Εὗρον‡ *ἔπειτ' Ὀδυσῆα, Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντον.*
[*Il.* B. 169.]

Τῶν ἄρ'§ *Ὀδυσσεὺς ἦρχε, Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος.*
[*Il.* B. 636.]

[* Eds. *ferrum.* Bentley quoted the line from memory, and its similarity to v. 594. *Æn.* iv. occasioned the error,—

"Ferte citi *flammas,* date vela, inpellite remos."

Vossius and Dawes made the very same false citation: see *Miscel. Crit.* p. 25. (and Kidd's note), *ed.* 1827.—D.]

[† "Exemplum suppeditat Æschylus ipse, *Suppl.* 179.

Ὁρῶ κόνιν ἄνανδον ἄγγελον στρατοῦ."

GAISFORD *ad Hephæst.*, p. 283.—D.]

[‡ Eds. Εὕρεν.—D.]

[§ Eds. Τῶν μὲν.—D.]

And Aristophanes in his Ὄρνιθες;

Ὁπότ' ἐξέλθοι Πρίαμός τις ἔχων ὄρνιν ἐν τοῖσι
τραγῳδοῖς. [v. 512. *ed. Bekk.*]

(II.) Let us see now the remaining example that he fetches out of Æschylus;

Νῦν δ' αἰθέριον κίνυγμ' ὁ τάλας.
[*Prom.*] v. 156. [=163. *ed. Blom.*]

This also is one of his tribrachs; for he is so well versed in Greek poetry, that he believes the last syllable of τάλας is short. What says he then to this anapæstic of the same poet?

Τεύξῃ· κεῖνος δ', ὁ τάλας, ἄγοος.
Sept. Theb. 1071. [=1066. *ed. Blom.*]

Will he make tribrachs in the middle of the verse, as well as at the end? And what says he to these of Euripides?

Καὶ μὴν ὁ τάλας ὅδε δὴ στείχει.
Hippol. [v. 1338. *ed. Monk.*]

Ἀπόλωλα τάλας· οἴμοι, οἴμοι. [*Id.* v. 1347. *ed. Monk.*]

Or to those iambics out of the same play?

Οὐ τλητὸν, οὐδὲ λεκτόν· ὦ τάλας ἐγώ.
[v. 879. *ed. Monk.*]

Ἄρηρεν, ὡς ἔοικεν· ὦ τάλας ἐγώ. [v. 1093. *ed. Monk.*]

Or to these out of Sophocles?

Οἴμοι τάλας. ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ Τυδέως γόνος.
Philoct. [v. 415. *ed. Erf.*]

Ἴησι δυσθρήνητον· ὦ τάλας ἐγώ.
Antigone. [v. 1195. *ed. Erf.*]

Οἴμοι τάλας· ἔοικ' ἐμαυτὸν εἰς ἀράς.
Œd. Tyr. [v. 735. *ed. Erf.*]

Ὡς ὧδ' ἐχόντων—ὦ τάλας ἐγὼ, τάλας.
Ajace. [v. 970. *ed. Erf.*]

I believe there is scarce one play extant, either comedy or tragedy, that does not afford us an instance against the Examiner. But let him find if he can, *or his Assistant that searches for him*, one single passage there, that makes λας in τάλας to be short. Where had he his eyes then, or what was he thinking on, when he made this observation? Perhaps he might remember that verse of Theocritus,

Ὃς μοι δωδεκαταῖος ἀφ' ὦ τάλας οὐδέποθ' ἥκει.
Id. ii. [4.]

For there, indeed, τάλας is short; but surely such a learned Grecian would know that this was the Doric idiom, and not to be drawn into example where that dialect is not used. For the Dorians abbreviate even ας in the accusative plural; as the same Theocritus,

Βόσκονται κατ' ὄρος, καὶ ὁ Τίτυρος αὐτὰς ἐλαύνει.
Τίτυρ', ἐμὶν τὸ καλὸν πεφιλαμένε, βόσκε τὰς αἶγας.
Id. iii. [2.]

I have now gone over all the instances that the Examiner has thought fit to produce out of the Greek poets; and I must own that, when I look back upon them, I cannot think without some astonishment upon the hardiness of this forward writer, who, when he was utterly unfurnished of this part of learning, could venture so beyond his depth, without any necessity. He has gone, as he says, *out of his way*, to seek an occasion to expose himself; which was a very needless ramble, for he can expose himself in every page, without stirring a foot from his subject. And what provocation could he have to be meddling with Greek anapæsts, who has shewn his ignorance of the most vulgar measures in Latin iambics? In the LXXXI. Ep. of his *Phalaris* he has thus translated a Greek distich;

Multò videtur satiùs, timentem nihil
Futura fata, quàm timentem, perpeti.

The first of which is a false verse, and betrays the skill of its author, who, if he had been in the least sensible that his verse was lame, might have had another word, *metuentem*, ready at hand for him.

But our Examiner, not content to have lessened his reputation for verses by an unfortunate essay upon Æschylus, seems resolved to be prodigal of that little which is yet left him, and lose it all with playing the critic upon Seneca's tragedies (p. 159).

(I.) His first attempt is upon a passage in *Agamemnon;*

Trucibus monstris. Stetit imposita
Pelion Ossa: pinifer ambos
Pressit Olympus. *Agam.* v. 337.

This he produces as an instance that a tribrachys may be the last foot of an anapæstic verse; which supposes that he thought *imposita* had its last syllable short here; and consequently *imposita Ossa*, in Mr. B.'s construction, are the nominative case. Now, I would desire a small favour of him; that, if it be not too great a secret, he'll acquaint us how he construes this passage. Is it, *Ossa imposita stetit Pelion?* but the word *stetit* with an accusative after it will be a very great rarity. Or is it, *Ossa stetit imposita Pelion?* but this *imposita* before an accusative will be a greater rarity than the other. Besides, if *imposita* be a tribrachys at the end of the verse, then *Ossa* will be a trochee in the middle of the verse; which will not only be contrary to my new discovery about anapæsts, but to all the old ones that ever were heard of. But one may suspect from this passage, that Mr. B. has a particular Grammar made for his use, as well as a particular Logic. When he obliges the public with it, we shall be ready to receive instruction. But till then we

shall take *imposita*, as every body, before he arose, understood it, to be the ablative case,

—— *Stetit impositá*
Pelion Ossá ——

It has now been in the world about XVI. whole centuries; and it's hardly to be believed that such an awkward construction has ever been put upon't before, except perhaps in some lower class at a grammar-school.

Of the four passages yet behind, which he cites as out of Seneca, no fewer than three are taken out of *Hercules Œtæus*, which is not a play of Seneca's, as the learned Daniel Heinsius has proved fourscore years ago: so that the Examiner cannot cry out in his usual strain, that this is a paradox of mine. There is *one* single example left then, out of Seneca's *Medea*, to confute me for asserting that he does it *once or twice*. A very gentle and civil antagonist! Though I must tell him, if he had brought six instances, and all of them legitimate ones, he had only shewed his good will to cavil and carp. For *semel atque iterùm*, ἅπαξ καὶ δὶς, are not strictly tied up to denote *twice* and no more: they often signify *seldom;* as δὶς καὶ τρὶς, *bis terque, iterùm atque tertium*, mean not *thrice* only, but *often*. Ten times therefore may be *seldom, semel atque iterùm*, if the whole number, that they relate to, be some hundreds or a thousand.

And now I have followed our learned Examiner, *while he has been wandering from his subject:* and I leave him to reflect at his leisure, how much honour he has acquired by this same ramble of his. It seems he, with his *fidus Achates*, sifted all that I had published in Latin; and he singled out this passage as the weakest place, where he might make a successful attack. And the victory seeming to be worthy of a digression, he went out of his way to fetch it. But I suppose he may be sensible by this time, *that 'tis not in* EVERY BODY'S *power to confute me, that do but cast their eye on Seneca and the Greek tragedians* (p. 160).

A man that does not only *cast an eye on*, but thoroughly reads, the books that he pretends to discourse of, would have been able to bring several seeming examples, where an anapæstic is terminated with a trochee, or a tribrachys, or a cretic. This I was aware of, when I published my observation; and yet I entered no caution about it to the reader, but left the thing entirely to his own judgment and sagacity; supposing that, if he took notice of any such exceptions, he would be able of himself to give an account of them. But now, because this observation of mine has been openly assaulted, and lest any body should think, that not its own truth and solidity, but the weakness of the assailant, may be the reason of its holding out; I will here produce every single exception that I can meet with in the three Greek tragedians, and Aristophanes, and Seneca; and shew they are all errors only, and mistakes of the copiers. And the very facility and naturalness of every correction will be next to a demonstration to an ingenuous mind, that the observation must needs be true.

1. Æschyl. *Prom.* v. 279. [=287. *ed. Blom.*]

Καὶ νῦν ἐλαφρῷ ποδὶ κραιπνόσσυτον
Θῶκον προλιποῦσ' —

Here's a cretic terminates the verse; and, if the reading be allowed, it plainly proves, against me, that the last syllable is common. But we must correct it *κραιπνόσυτον*, with a single *σ*, and then it is an anapæst. The poets use either the single or double consonant, as their measures require. Hesychius, *Αὐτόσυτος, αὐτοκέλευστος, Σοφοκλῆς Σκυρίοις.*

2. Æschyl. *Eumen.* v. 1008.

Πρὸς φῶς ἱερὸν τῶνδε προπομπὸν
Ἴτε, καὶ σφαγίων τῶνδ' ὑπὸ σεμνῶν
Κατὰ γῆς σύμεναι, τὸ μὲν ἀτήριον
Χώρας κατέχειν —

The first verse here ends with a trochee, and the third with a

cretic; both of which are seeming instances against my assertion. But in the first verse we must read *προπομπῶν*, as the learned Mr. Stanley[1] guessed from the sense of the place; and his conjecture is now confirmed by the measure of it. And in the third verse, for *ἀτήριον* I correct it *ἀτηρὸν*, which is a word of the same signification, and of more frequent use than the other: witness Æschylus himself;

Δυσχείμερόν γε πέλαγος ἀτηρᾶς δύης.
Prometh. 745. [=771. *ed. Blom.*]

3. Sophoc. *Elect.* v. 112.

Σεμναί τε θεῶν παῖδες Ἐριννύες
*Τοὺς ἀδίκως θνήσκοντας ὁρᾶτε.**

Here again is a cretic in the close of the first verse; but it will be a dactyl if the second verse be read, as it ought to be, without *τοὺς*;

Ἀδίκως θνήσκοντας ὁρᾶτε.

'Tis the *versus paræmiacus*, which always comes at the end of a set of anapæstics; and there the trochee in *ὁρᾶτε* is right and lawful.

4. Soph. *Antig.* v. 129. [=128. *ed. Erf.*]

Ὑπερεχθαίρει· καὶ σφᾶς εἰσιδών.

This cretic foot, *εἰσιδών*, is an error of the copier, instead of the anapæst, *ἐσιδών*.

[1] Stanley in Not. Forsan *προπομπῶν*.

[* On these lines, as cited by Bentley, Porson remarked, "*αἳ τοὺς* Aldus: legendum,

—— *Ἐριννύες*
αἳ τοὺς ἀδίκως θνήσκοντας ὁρᾶτ',
ἔλθετ' ——

et versus qui post *ὁρᾶτε* sequitur, delendus. Neque enim adulteriis et ejusmodi nugis immorabantur, in cædibus et incestu puniendis satagentes Furiæ." *Tracts, &c. ed. by Kidd*, p. 315.—D.]

5. Soph. *Philoct. in fine.*

Χωρῶμεν νῦν πάντες ἀολλέες,
Νύμφαις ἁλίαισιν ἐπευξάμενοι.

This cretic too will become a spondee by the easy and slight alteration of *ἀολλέες* into *ἀολλεῖς*, which is the true reading.

6. Eurip. *Medea*, v. 1087. [=1083. *ed. Por.*]

Παῦρον δὴ γένος ἐν πολλαῖσιν
Εὔροις ἂν ἴσως —

Here's a trochee in the end of a verse; but if we correct it *πολλαῖσίν γ'*,* it will then be a spondee, as it ought to be.

7. *Ibid.* v. 1103. [=1099. *ed. Por.*]

Ἔτι δ' ἐκ τούτων, εἴτ' ἐπὶ φλαύροις,
Εἴτ' ἐπὶ χρηστοῖς μοχθοῦσι, τόδε
Ἔστιν ἄδηλον.

The middle verse here, as it is vulgarly read, is an instance against me; but the measures ought to be altered and distinguished thus,

Εἴτ' ἐπὶ χρηστοῖς
Μοχθοῦσι, τόδ' ἔστιν ἄδηλον.

Where the last verse now is a paræmiac; and the little verse called the *anapæstic basis* commonly comes before it.

8. *Ibid.* v. 1405. [=1402. *ed. Por.*]

Ζεῦ, τάδ' ἀκούεις, ὡς ἀπελαυνόμεσθ'.

This cretic in the close is easily cured by reading *ἀπελαυνόμεθ'*.

[* Porson gives the line,

Παῦρον γὰρ δὴ γένος ἐν πολλαῖς,—

and observes in the note, "*πολλαῖσίν γ'*, Heathio dignius quàm Bentleio."—D.]

9. *Ib.* v. 1413. [=1410. *ed. Por.*]

Οὓς μή ποτ' ἐγὼ φύσας ὤφελον
Πρὸς σοῦ φθιμένους ἐπιδέσθαι.

Correct it *ὄφελον** in the first verse, and then the cretic will be an anapæst, as it should be.

10. Eurip. *Hippol.* v. 257. [=252. *ed. Monk.*]

Πολλὰ διδάσκει γάρ μ' ὁ πολὺς βίος,
Χρῆν γὰρ μετρίας εἰς ἀλλήλας,† &c.

Here again is a cretic in the first verse; but the word *γὰρ* there is superfluous, as the very sense evinces. For this sentence is not given here as a reason of the other that precedes it, as it must be if *γὰρ* be allowed for a true lection. I correct it therefore,

Πολλὰ διδάσκει μ' ὁ πολὺς βίοτος.

And I do not question but men of judgment ‡ will subscribe to the emendation.

11. Eurip. *Troad.* v. 781. [=788. *ed. Matth.*]

Λαμβάνετ' αὐτὸν. τὰ δὲ τοιαῦτα χρὴ
Κηρυκεύειν —

A small change of a word, by reading it *τὰ δὲ τοιάδε χρὴ*, will substitute an anapæst in the place of the cretic.

12. Aristoph. *Nub.* pag. 106. [=v. 908. *ed. Bekk.*§]

Γνωσθήση ποτ' Ἀθηναίοισιν,
Οἷα διδάσκεις τοὺς ἀνοήτους.

[* Porson:

—— *ὄφελον*
ἐκ σοῦ —— D.]

[† Eds. *ἀλλήλους.*—D.]

[‡ "A parody of Euripides in that very scene, *καὶ ξυμφήσουσι σοφοί μοι.*" Porson, in his *Tracts, ed. by Kidd*, p. 315.—D.]

[§ Where the reading is,

Καὶ *γνωσθήσει ποτ' Ἀθηναίοις.*

If we add γ' to the end of the first verse, this little flaw will be healed.

There, I believe, are all the verses in the four poets of the Greek stage that are exceptions to my observation about the measure of anapæsts; or, if perhaps I have overlooked one, I dare engage before-hand that it may as easily be corrected as these that I have noted. But if the Examiner thinks fit to *cast his eye* again to search for more, that he thinks may have escaped me, I would advise him to take care that his instances be not of the same stamp with those he has brought already. For it's good to understand a matter first, before we pretend to confute it.

As for Seneca, among all the plays that judicious persons suppose to be his, I have not once observed a tribrachys, nor a cretic, at the end of an anapæstic; nor have I met with a trochee without a pause or close of the sense after it, except in these two places:

Herc. Fur. v. 170.

Fluctuque magis mobile vulgus
Aurâ tumidum tollit inani.

Medea, v. 334. [= 344. *ed. Schröd.*]

— Spargeret astra
Nubesque ipsas —

These two, I believe, are the only examples: and had I not reason then to say, that *semel atque iterùm, once or twice only,* he made use of a trochee? 'Tis true, there may be an instance or two where a verse ends in a long vowel and the following begins with another vowel; as,

Bentley, in a Letter to Kuster (*Mus. Crit.* ii. 444.), says, " Repone

Γνωσθήσει ποτ' Ἀθηναίοισιν
Χ' οἷα," κ. τ. λ.

Hermann, in his ed. of the *Nubes*, 1830, gives

Γνωσθήσει τοι πότ' Ἀθηναίοις. D.]

Thyest. v. 946. [= 948. *ed. Schröd.*]

Pingui madidus crinis amomo
Inter subitos stetit horrores.

But in this case the measure is right, and agreeable to our observation; only the vowels must be supposed to stand and to be pronounced without a synalœpha; as they often are in Virgil;

Glauco, et Panopeæ, et Inoo Melicertæ.
[*Georg.* i. 437.]

Nereidum matri, et Neptuno Ægæo.
[*Æn.* iii. 74. *Cir.* 474.]

Upon the whole, then, there is not *one* true and lawful exception in all the Greek poets; and but *two* in the genuine pieces of Seneca. But the writers that came after him degenerated more from their Greek masters, and did not so strictly observe the measures that the rules of their art prescribed to them. For in the tragedy *Agamemnon* this measure is four times broken;[m] and in *Hercules Œtæus* six times;[n] and in *Octavia* no less than eleven.[o] Which may pass for a new argument that Seneca is not the author of them. But, if one cast his eyes upon Buchanan's pieces, or Scaliger's, or Grotius's, or indeed of any one of the moderns (for none were aware of this observation), he will not find ten lines together where this measure is not violated. Which I take for an infallible demonstration, that it was design, and not mere accident, that kept the ancients from breaking it.

To put an end, therefore, to this long debate about the Thericlean cups: if the Examiner's cavils against Athenæus are all fully and seriously answered; if his quirks and

[m] Agam. v. 79, 89, 356, 380.

[n] Herc. Œt. v. 181, 594, 1210, 1282, 1876, 1988.

[o] Octav. v. 27, 62, 93, 289, 306, 315, 318, 331, 336, 809, 899. [See Kidd's remarks on this portion of Bentley's work, in a note on Dawes's *Miscel. Crit.*, p. 57. *ed.* 1827.—D.]

witticisms upon me are all grafted upon his own mistakes, and, by being falsely applied to another, become *true jests* upon himself; and if *his wandering from his subject*, to seek an occasion of refuting me, has proved a very unfortunate excursion, and sent him back with loss and disgrace; if this, I say, be the issue of this present section, I conceive there appears no good reason as yet, why I should repent of my judgment about Phalaris's *Epistles*.

IV.

In the LXXXV. Epistle he boasts of a great victory obtained over the Zancleans; Ταυρομενείτας καὶ Ζαγκλείους συμμαχήσαντας Λεοντίνοις εἰς τέλος νενίκηκα. But the very preceding Letter, and the XXI., are directed to the Messenians, Μεσσηνίοις, and the city is there called Μεσσήνη; and in the first Epistle he speaks of Πολύκλειτος ὁ Μεσσήνιος. Here we see we have mention made of Zanclæans and Messenians, as if Zancle and Messana were two different towns. Certainly the true Phalaris could not write thus; and it is a piece of ignorance inexcusable in our Sophist, not to know that both those names belonged to one and the same city at different times. *Messana*, says Strabo,[p] *which was before called Zancle.* See also Herodotus,[q] and Diodorus,[r] and others. Perhaps it may be suspected, in behalf of these *Epistles*, that this change of name was made during those XVI. years of Phalaris's tyranny; and then, supposing the LXXXV. Letter to be written before the change, and the other three after it, this argument will be evaded. But Thucydides

[p] Lib. vi. Μεσσήνη . . . . Ζάγκλη πρότερον καλουμένη.

[q] Herod. vii. Ζάγκλην, τὴν ἐς Μεσσήνην μεταβαλοῦσαν τοὔνομα.

[r] Diod. iv. Ζάγκλης, νῦν δὲ Μεσσήνης ὀνομαζομένης.

will not suffer this suspicion to pass, who relates, *That the Zanclæans were driven out by the Samians and other Ionians that fled from the Medes* (which was about Olymp. LXX. 4.), *and that οὐ πολλῷ ὕστερον, not long after* (perhaps about the time of Xerxes's expedition into Greece, Olymp. LXXV. 1.), *Anaxilas* king of Rhegium drove the Samians themselves out, and called the town Messana, from the Peloponnesian Messana, the country of his ancestors.*† The first part of this account is confirmed by Herodotus;[s] and agreeably to these narratives, Diodorus[t] sets down the death of this Anaxilas Olymp. LXXVI. 1., when he had reigned XVIII. years. Take now the latest account of Phalaris's death, according to St. Hierom; and above LX. years intervene between that and the new-naming of Zancle. So that, unless we dare ascribe to the Tyrant a spirit of vaticination, we cannot acquit the author of the *Letters* of so manifest a cheat.

But I love to deal ingenuously, and will not conceal one testimony in his favour, which is that of Pausanias,[u] who places this same Anaxilas of Rhegium about CLXXX. years higher than Herodotus and Thucydides do, and tells the story very differently; that he assisted the refugees of Messana in Peloponnesus, after the second war with the Spartans, to take Zancle in Sicily, which thereupon was called Messana, Olymp. XXIX. *These things,* says he, *were done at the* XXIX. *Olympiad, when Chionis the Spartan won the Olympic race the second time, Miltiades being*

[* In the old ed. Bentley several times writes the name *Anaxilaus*, but much oftener *Anaxilas*.—D.] [† Thucyd. vi. 4 and 5.—D.]

[s] Lib. vi. cap. 23. [t] Lib. xi. p. 37. [u] Messen. p. 134.

Archon at Athens.[v] Now, if this be true, we must needs put in one word for our Sophist; that Phalaris might name the Messenians without pretending to the gift of prophecy. Cluverius indeed[w] would spoil all again; for he makes it a fault in our copies of Pausanias, and for εἰκοστῆς the XXIX. Olymp. reads ἑξηκοστῆς the LXIX.; which is too great a number to do our author any service. But we will not take an advantage against him from a mistake of Cluverius; for, without question, the true lection is εἰκοστῆς, the XXIX.; because the time of the Messenian war agrees with that computation, and not with the other; and the ancient Catalogue of the *Stadionicæ* puts Chionis's victory at that very year.[x] So that, if Pausanias's credit is able to bear him out, our author, as to this present point, may still come off with reputation. But, alas! what can Pausanias do for him, or for himself, against Herodotus and Thucydides, that lived so near the time they speak of? against those other unknown authors, that Diodorus transcribed? against the whole tenour of history, confirmed by so many synchronisms and concurrences, that even demonstrate Anaxilas to have lived in the days of Xerxes and his father; when Theron, and not Phalaris, was μούναρχος, *monarch*, of Agrigentum?[y] Nay, though we should be so obliging, so partial to our Sophist, as for his sake to credit Pausanias against so

[v] Ταῦτα δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος ἐπράχθη τῆς ἐνάτης καὶ εἰκοστῆς, ἣν Χιόνις Λάκων τὸ δεύτερον ἐνίκα, Μιλτιάδου παρ' Ἀθηναίοις ἄρχοντος.

[w] Sicil. Antiq. p. 85.

[x] Euseb. Scalig. p. 39. Ὀλυμπιὰς εἰκοστὴ ἐνάτη· Χιόνις Λάκων στάδιον. Τριακοστή· ὁ αὐτὸς τὸ δεύτερον.

[y] Herodot. lib. vii. p. 438.

much greater authority, yet still the botch is incurable; 'tis running in debt with one man, to pay off another. For, how then comes it to pass, that the Messenians in another Letter are in this called Zanclæans? which, by that reckoning of Pausanias, had been an obsolete forgotten word an hundred years before the date of this pretended Epistle.

The main controversy in this section between the learned Mr. Boyle and me is; whether Pausanias, who stands alone, or Herodotus, Thucydides, and others, are to be followed in the story of Anaxilas Tyrant of Rhegium. Mr. Boyle says, *he has Ubo Emmius, Lydiate, Scaliger, Petavius, and Meursius, on his side,* (all of them great names in the commonwealth of learning,) *besides half a dozen more, that he'll throw into the scale the next time he and I talk together* (p. 131). Hitherto, as I think, he has had nobody on his side; and yet his style has been as pert and positive, as if he carried demonstration in every sentence. No wonder then, that, in this section, where he is so powerfully backed, his bold air and his scornful language rise so much the higher. But this I easily neglect and forgive: 'tis my business now to shew my reasons which oblige me to dissent from those great men that have followed Pausanias: and the Examiner's cavils and exceptions shall be all considered in the rear.

I. In the first place, therefore, I will prove that Pausanias and the rest do all mean the same person; the only difference being about the time when he lived, and some circumstances of his story. For Pausanias's Anaxilas was *Tyrant of Rhegium,*[z] *and he besieged and took Zancle;*[a] *and on that occasion the name of Zancle was changed into Mes-*

[z] Paus. p. 133. Ἐτυράννει μὲν Ῥηγίου. P. 175. Ῥηγίου τυραννήσαντος. [Eds. τοῦ ἐν Ῥηγίῳ, κ. τ. λ.—D.]

[a] P. 134.

sana.[b] And so the Anaxilas of Thucydides was *Tyrant of Rhegium,*[c] *and took Zancle, and called it Messana, from the country of his ancestors.*[d] These circumstances are a plain demonstration that Pausanias and Thucydides speak of one and the same man. For it's incredible that there were two Anaxilas's Tyrants of Rhegium, and that both of them took Zancle; and it's impossible that both of them should first name the town Messana.

And then the Anaxilas of Herodotus is the same person that Thucydides and Pausanias speak of. For Thucydides's Anaxilas took Zancle *not long after* the Samians,[e] who had fled from the Medes, settled there. And Herodotus's Anaxilas was then Tyrant of Rhegium *when the Samians fled from the Medes, and was the man that persuaded them to settle at Zancle.*[f] And *he had a servant and steward, called Micythus, the son of Chœrus;*[g] but the same man was servant too to the Anaxilas of Pausanias, who cites Herodotus to witness it.[h] This too is a clear argument that Pausanias in both places means one and the same Anaxilas.[i]

The Anaxilas, too, in Diodorus is the very same that is mentioned by Herodotus and Pausanias. For he also was *Tyrant of Rhegium and Zancle; and had a steward called Micythus, the guardian of his children.*[j]

Macrobius says, that *Anaxilas Tyrant of Rhegium, who built Messana in Sicily, made Micythus his servant a trustee for his sons, till they were of age to come to the government.*[k] So that this too is the same person that is spoken of by the others.

Among the Sicilian Tyrants, says Justin, *Anaxilas was as eminent for his justice as the others for their cruelty;*[l] *and he*

[b] Ibid.
[c] Ῥηγίνων τύραννος. Thuc. p. 114.
[d] Ibid.
[e] Οὐ πολλῷ ὕστερον. Thuc. ibid.
[f] Herod. p. 341.
[g] Her. p. 440.
[h] Paus. p. 175.
[i] P. 133, 175.
[j] Diod. 37. Ὁ Ῥηγίου καὶ Ζάγκλης τύραννος. and p. 50.
[k] Macrob. i. Satur. p. 203.
[l] Justin. iv. 2. Anaxilaus justitiâ cum cæterorum crudelitate certabat.

left his sons in their minority under the tutelage of Micythus his servant. Here again is the very same person.

Stobæus gives us a saying of Anaxilas Tyrant of Rhegium, *That to be never outdone in beneficence, was a more happy thing than to wear a crown.*[m] This is the same that Justin speaks of, as it appears from the character of his justice.

In the Scholiast of Pindar we are told too of one *Anaxilas the Tyrant of Rhegium and Messana;*[n] who must needs be the same with him that Thucydides, and Diodorus, and Herodotus mention, because the time of the tyranny exactly agrees. There is mention there of a son of his, called Cleophron.[o]

Dionysius Halicarnassensis says, *That one Anaxilas seized the castle of Rhegium, and so became Tyrant there, and left the government to his son Leophron.*[p] Which is a clear intimation that he means the same person that the Scholiast of Pindar does; for Cleophron in the Scholiast is the same that is here called Leophron. Justin too mentions this *Leophron the Tyrant of Rhegium;*[q] so that it seems that the name in the Scholiast should be corrected from these two authors.

Aristotle tells us, *That the government of Rhegium was once an oligarchy, and was changed into a tyranny by Anaxilas.*[r] And this was the same Anaxilas with him in Dionysius; for he too had not the tyranny from his father by succession, but usurped it by seizing the citadel.

And lastly, Heraclides says, *That the Rhegians were formerly under an aristocracy, till Anaxilas the Messenian*

[m] Stob. Serm. xlvi. Τυραννίδος μακαριώτερον, τὸ μηδέποτε εὐεργετοῦντα νικηθῆναι.

[n] Pyth. i. et Pyth. ii. Ἀναξίλας Ῥηγίου καὶ Μεσσήνης τύραννος.

[o] Pyth. ii. Ἀναξίλας καὶ Κλεόφρων ὁ τούτου παῖς.

[p] Excerp. Vales. p. 539. Λεόφρονι τῷ παιδί.

[q] Just. xxi. 3. Leophron Rheginorum tyrannus.

[r] Polit. 6. Ἐν Ῥηγίῳ ἐξ ὀλιγαρχίας εἰς Ἀναξιλάου τυραννίδα.

made himself tyrant there.[s] Which shews him to be the person already mentioned by Dionysius and Aristotle.

Thus, I conceive, I have made it clear, and beyond all rational doubt, that all these authors mean one and the same man, Anaxilas the Tyrant of Rhegium and Messana. For all their testimonies are here linked one to another by some certain circumstance and characteristic, that specifies and determines him to be the same person.

II. In the next place, I proceed to inquire about the age that he lived in: and I am very much in the wrong, if it will not presently appear that Anaxilas was alive, not Olymp. XXIX., as Pausanias says, but near CC. years after it, in the reigns of Darius and Xerxes.

First, Herodotus gives a particular account,[t] that when Miletus was sacked by the Persians in Darius's time (about Olymp. LXX. 3.), the Zanclæans invited the remainder of the Milesians to come and plant themselves in Sicily, at a place called Calacta. The Milesians accept the offer, and, taking the Samians to be partners with them, set sail for Sicily; but by the way they touch at Locri in Italy, where Anaxilas Tyrant of Rhegium, hearing of their design, persuades them to quit the thoughts of founding a town at Calacta, and to seize upon Zancle, a brave city, ready built to their hands. For it happened that at that juncture the Zanclæans were employed abroad in besieging some other town, and had left their own without defence. The Samians and Milesians take his advice, and possess the empty city without opposition.

And the substance of this whole narrative is confirmed by Thucydides, who expressly says, *That the Zanclæans were dispossessed of their city by those Samians and other Ionians that fled from the Medes;*[u] that is, after the destruction of Miletus, Olymp. LXX. 3. The same is intimated too by Aristotle, where he says, *That the Zanclæans, permitting the*

[s] In Polit. Ἀριστοκρατικὴν πολιτείαν.

[t] Herod. vi. 22, 23.

[u] Thuc. vi. p. 414.

Samians to dwell with them, lost their own city.[v] But Thucydides goes on, and informs us, *That, not long after,*[w] *these Samians themselves were beat out of Zancle by Anaxilas Tyrant of Rhegium, who planted a new colony there, a medley of several nations; and named the city Messana, from Messana in Peloponnesus, whence his ancestors were derived.* Now, this last particular is not touched upon by Herodotus; but only the former, that had happened *not long* before it. Neither is there any inconsistency, as the Examiner imagines, in the accounts of these two authors.

We have lost those Books of Diodorus's *Annals* where these actions ought to be recorded; for what is extant of them commences at the expedition of Xerxes, Olymp. LXXV. 1. But, however, we have enough of him preserved, to demonstrate what side he was of. For he places the death of this same Anaxilas at Ol. LXXVI. 1.,[x] and says that he had reigned XVIII. years, that is, from Olymp. LXXI. 3. This is positive and full against Pausanias's reckoning. 'Tis true there's a seeming disagreement between Diodorus and Herodotus; for the latter calls him *Tyrant* at the time of his congress with the Samians, which is supposed to be a year or two before Olymp. LXXI. 3. But, if the number in Diodorus be not an error of the copier, we may compound the difference thus; that Herodotus might call him *Tyrant*, because he knew he was so afterwards; though at that time he was only a leading man, and had not actually seized the government.

When Anaxilas advised the Samians to set upon Zancle, one Scythes was at that time Tyrant of the Zanclæans.[y] Now, the age of this Scythes, and consequently of Anaxilas, is well known by his story. He was kept a prisoner at Inycum, a Sicilian town;[z] but made his escape into Persia, and there lived in the court of Darius the son of Hystaspes;

[v] Arist. Polit. v.
[w] Οὐ πολλῷ ὕστερον.
[x] Diod. p. 37.
[y] Herod. vi. 23.
[z] Herod. vi. 24. Ælian. Var. Hist. viii. 17.

and, having got leave to make a visit to Sicily, upon a promise to return when his affairs were despatched, he was as good as his word, and was much esteemed afterwards by the king for his honesty and veracity. But Pausanias's date is above a hundred years before this Darius was born.

Anaxilas married Cydippe, the daughter of Terillus Tyrant of Himera,[a] who was driven out of his government by Theron of Agrigentum, and fled for succour to Carthage. And Anaxilas, endeavouring the restoration of his father-in-law, invites Hamilcar the Carthaginian general to make a descent upon Sicily, and gives him his sons to be hostages for his fidelity.[b] Upon these invitations, Hamilcar comes with a mighty fleet, and, having landed them at Himera, was entirely routed by Gelo the Syracusian, at the very same time that Xerxes was beat by the Greeks. All historians are agreed upon the year when this action was done, which is almost two whole centuries after Olymp. XXIX. Even Pausanias himself affirms that this Gelo got the government of Syracuse Ol. LXXII. 2., and enjoyed it at the time of Xerxes's expedition.[c]

When the Samians invaded Zancle, a great agent in that affair was Hippocrates Tyrant of Gela; for he betrayed the Zanclæans his allies, and shared the booty with the Samians.[d] But we know Hippocrates's time from one certain circumstance among many others, that the famous Gelo, afterwards Monarch of Syracuse, whom we have just now spoken of, was master of his horse, and afterwards succeeded him in the government of Gela.[e]

Our Anaxilas had war with the Locrians of Italy, and was resolved to extirpate them, had not Hiero Tyrant of Syracuse interposed. This is intimated by Pindar, who lived at the very time, in two odes to Hiero: but the Scholiast, who is a very credible writer, says it expressly;[f] and he

[a] Herod.
[b] Herod., Diod., &c.
[c] Paus. p. 186 and 272.
[d] Herod. vi. 23.
[e] Herod. vii. 154. Timæus apud Schol. Pindari Nem. ix.
[f] Pind. Schol. ad Pyth. i. et ii.

adds, that one of Hiero's wives was Anaxilas's daughter; and that Epicharmus, in a play of his called *The Islands*, relates how Anaxilas had a design to ruin the Locrians, and was hindered by Hiero.[g] What can be said against so clear and convincing a testimony? Epicharmus lived in Hiero's court; he tells a thing done within his own memory; and he might be personally acquainted with Anaxilas, whom we are speaking of. Now Pausanias himself, as well as other historians, declares, that Hiero was contemporary with Xerxes:[h] and that Epicharmus was contemporary with Hiero,[i] is as certain as the other.

Aristotle tells a pleasant story of Simonides the lyric poet,[j] that when one that had got the prize at Olympia with his chariot of mules offered him a small fee to make an ode upon his victory, he pretended he would not disgrace his Muse by so mean a subject as mules: but when the person advanced a great price, he could presently call them, not *mules*, but *the daughters of mares;*

Χαίρετ' ἀελλοπόδων θύγατρες ἵππων.

Aristotle indeed does not say who it was that had won the prize, but his scholar Heraclides does. *When Anaxilas*, says he,[k] *the Messenian, the Tyrant of Rhegium, had got the victory with his mules at Olympia, he gave a treat to the spectators; and Simonides made a copy of verses upon his victory;*

Χαίρετ' ἀελλοπόδων θυγατέρες ἵππων.

And in memory of this prize, as the antiquaries suppose, some of the coins of the Messenians[l] have on their reverse an *ἀπήνη*, or chariot drawn by mules.[m] Now, the age of

[g] Ὅτι δὲ Ἀναξίλαος Λοκροὺς ἐθέλησεν ἄρδην ἀπολέσαι, καὶ ἐκωλύθη πρὸς Ἱέρωνος, ἱστορεῖ καὶ Ἐπίχαρμος ἐν Νάσοις.

[h] Paus. p. 272. [i] Marm. Arund., &c. [j] Arist. Rhet. iii. 2.

[k] Heracl. de Polit. [l] Goltz., Paruta.

[m] Pollux also (v. 12.) speaks of Anaxilas's victory with the ἀπήνη; and he adds, that at the same time he brought a breed of hares into Sicily, which before

Simonides can never agree with Pausanias's date, Olymp. XXIX.; for he was not born till Olymp. LV. 3., as we have it under his own hand;[n] but it exactly hits with the other reckoning; for he was in mighty esteem in Greece during the whole reign of Anaxilas, from Olymp. LXXI. 3. to Olymp. LXXVI. 1.

Again, we have another argument from this Olympian victory, which will confute the account of Pausanias, even from his own words. For the *ἀπήνη, the chariot that was drawn with mules instead of horses, was not used at the Olympics till Olymp.* LXX., as Pausanias confesses;[o] *and it was cried down again Olymp.* LXXXIV. And *the first,* he says, *that won the prize at this match was one Thersias, a Thessalian.*[p] So that Anaxilas's victory cannot possibly be dated before Olymp. LXXI. And besides Pausanias, we have another very good authority for the first usage of the *ἀπήνη*. For Pindar, it seems, whether he was less scrupulous than Simonides, or else as well fee'd as he, has left us two odes upon victories by mules:[q] and the first victory was gotten Ol. LXXXII.;[r] and there the Scholiast informs us, *Ὅτι ἀπήνη ἐστὶν ἅρμα ἐξ ἡμιόνων ζευχθέν· εἰσθισμένον δὲ ἵπποις ἀγωνίζεσθαι, Ἀσάνδραστος ἐπετήδευσε καὶ ἡμιόνοις ἀγωνίζεσθαι· χρόνος δέ τις οὐ μακρὸς, ἀλλὰ δεκαετὴς τοῦτο διέλυσε, διελύθη γὰρ περὶ [τὴν] ὀγδοηκοστὴν ἐννάτην Ὀλυμπιάδα:** *That the ἀπήνη was a chariot drawn by mules: and the old custom at the Olympics being only to use horses, Asandrastus first introduced there the chariots with mules. But they did not continue long, for they were left off in ten years' time, about*

had none of those animals; and in the money of the Rhegians he stamped an ἀπήνη and a hare. This, Pollux tells us out of Aristotle; but he seems to have mistaken the money of the Rhegians for that of the Messenians. For among the Rhegian coins that can now be heard of among antiquaries, there are none of that stamp; but of the Messenian coins, there are VIII. in Paruta with an ἀπήνη on one side and a hare on the other; II. with an ἀπήνη without a hare; and II. with a hare, and on the reverse an Olympic crown. [*Adden.*]

[n] See above, p. 110, 111.

[o] Paus. p. 155. ἡμιόνους ἀντὶ ἵππων.

[p] Θερσίας, ibid.

[q] Olymp. v. et vi.

[r] Schol. ibid.

[* Ad *Olymp.* v. 6.—D.]

Olymp. LXXXIX. There's a fault, 'tis true, either in one or both of these numbers; for if Psaumis's victory, which Pindar here celebrates, was Olymp. LXXXII., there's above ten years from that time to Olymp. LXXXIX. Yet, however, this passage, even taken with its faults, is sufficient for our purpose; for it implies that the ἀπήνη could not be in use in the Olympic games Ol. XXIX. The great Scaliger has made a great slip here;[s] for, by mere carelessness, he has placed this passage of the Scholiast at Olymp. LXXIX., which, without doubt, he designed to set at Olymp. LXXXIX.: and this has produced errors upon errors. The learned Meursius, who has confounded several of his own Books by unfortunately mistaking that Ἀναγραφὴ Ὀλυμπιάδων for an ancient piece, (though Scaliger had expressly owned it to be of his own composing,[t]) makes strange work with this passage. If I may venture after such great men, I would correct in the Scholiast δωδεκαετὴς, *a dozen years*, for δεκαετὴς, *ten years;* and instead of ὀγδοηκοστὴν ἐννάτην, *the* LXXXIX. *Olymp.*, I would read ὀγδ. πέμπτην, *Olymp. the* LXXXV. For this latter alteration I have a good voucher, even the Scholiast himself; who says in another place, *That the ἀπήνη was put down, as some say, at Olymp.* LXXXV.; *as others say, at Olymp.* LXXXVI.[u] And this agrees punctually with Pausanias quoted above. For if it was *cried by the public crier,*[v] at Olymp. LXXXIV., that thenceforward there should be no more races with mules, then the first time that it *was left off*[w] was Olymp. LXXXV. Now, if we reckon from Olymp. LXXXII., the date of Psaumis's victory, which was the subject of this ode of Pindar's, there are exactly *a dozen years* to Olymp. LXXXV. But who is that same Ἀσάνδραστος, that the Scholiast says was the author of these mule-races? Scaliger, I see, and Meursius have let the name pass for good, though I verily believe that both of them suspected it to be faulty; for it has

[s] Scalig. in Ὀλυμπ. Ἀναγρ. [t] P. 431. Not. ad Græca Eusebii.

[u] Pyth. vi. Κατελύθη δὲ ἀπήνη, ὅς τινές φασιν, πέ Ὀλυμπιάδι, κατ' ἑνίους δὲ πε'.

[v] Κήρυγμα ἐποιήσαντο. Paus. [w] Διελύθη. Schol.

not the turn and composition of a Greek name, as those that know the language will readily acknowledge. The words, as they lie together, are *ἀγωνίζεσθαι ἀσάνδραστος ἐπετήδευσε*; which I would read, *ἀγωνίζεσθαι Θέρσανδρός τις ἐπετήδευσε, one Thersander was the author of it. Θαι*, which in pronunciation and old writing was *θε*, stuck to the preceding word: as in that famous passage of Plutarch, *ἁρμονίαν καλεῖσθαι μέροπιν*,* I have shewn formerly that the true reading is *ἁρμονίαν καλεῖ θεμερῶπιν*.[x] And then the particle *τὶς* is almost necessary in this place; for, being to mention an obscure unknown person, he was obliged to say *one Thersander*. But, to confirm and establish the whole conjecture, this Thersander of the Scholiast is the very same person with Pausanias's Thersias: so that both the writers are agreed about the first introducer of mule-races at Olympia. For the Greek names of this form are equivalent, and are frequently confounded together;† *Θερσιας* and *Θέρσανδρος*, as *Νικίας* and *Νίκανδρος*, *Ἡγησίας* and *Ἡγήσανδρος*, *Ἀλεξίας* and *Ἀλέξανδρος*, *Ἀναξίας* and *Ἀνάξανδρος*, and many more like them.

Though I persuade myself that I have already effectually confuted Pausanias's date of Anaxilas, yet I have one argument more, that will quite overthrow his opinion; and every part of it shall be taken from his own Book. *Micythus*, says he, *the servant and steward of Anaxilas Tyrant of Rhegium, set up a great many statues and other donaries at Olympia.*[y] *And the workmen that made them were Dionysius and Glaucus, natives of Argos. Who was the master of these two statuaries, they give us no account; but we know the age they lived in, from Micythus that employed them to work for him.*[z] This inference is very true, and by consequence the reverse of it is true too; that we may know the age of Micythus, if

[* *μέροπι*.—D.]

[x] See Dissert. ad Johan. Malal. [p. 76. ed. 1691.—D.]

[† "*Thersias* = *Thersander*. Of this, Prof. Porson found no instance." PORSON'S *Tracts, &c. ed. by Kidd*, p. 315.—D.]

[y] Paus. p. 175.

[z] *Τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτῶν ὁ τὰ ἔργα εἰς Ὀλυμπίαν ἀναθεὶς ἐπιδείκνυσιν ὁ Ζμίκυθος.*

we can discover the age of those workmen. But Pausanias himself acquaints us,[a] *that one of them, Dionysius, did a piece of work for Phormis the Syracusian, the general of Gelo and Hiero.* And he is positive, *that Gelo and Hiero lived at the expedition of Xerxes;*[b] the very time when I state the tyranny of Anaxilas. There's no evasion to be made from this argument; for that Micythus was our Anaxilas's steward, we have, besides Pausanias, a whole crowd of good witnesses; Herodotus, Diodorus, Justin, Macrobius. And that he gave these donaries at such a time, not only Herodotus,[c] but the very inscriptions of them declare; for his own and the workman's name were engraven on them before their dedication; and Pausanias read them with his own eyes.

To return now to our Examiner, who has thus stated the present question, *That Anaxilas changed the name of Zancle into Messana, is agreed between Dr. B. and me; the only question is about the date of this change* (p. 128). Now, if that was agreed between us, that Anaxilas changed the name, I presume the question about the date of the change will be at an end. But, to take no advantage of this concession, I'll remit it to him again, and suppose in his favour, that though Pausanias was mistaken in introducing Anaxilas as an agent with the Messenians, yet for all that he may be in the right, that the Messenians took Zancle, and called it Messana at Ol. XXIX. But even in this part of the story (without bringing in Anaxilas), the whole current of history bears against Pausanias: for nobody besides him relates that the Messenians went directly to Zancle; but they all say, to Rhegium. And they all call the town by the name of Zancle, for CL. years after he says 'twas called Messana. Hippocrates besieged the Zanclæans; Cadmus the Coan came to the Samians at Zancle; the Zanclæans invited the Milesians to settle themselves in Sicily;[d] Xenophanes the

[a] P. 176. [b] P. 272.

[c] Herod. p. 440. Ἀνέθηκε ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ τοὺς πολλοὺς ἀνδριάντας.

[d] Herod., Thucyd.

Colophonian left his native country, and dwelt at Zancle.[e] The dates of all these are many generations below Ol. XXIX. Neither is there one single example of its being called Messana before the age of Anaxilas.

Let us see now the Examiner's cavils, and despatch them as briefly as we can. Thucydides says, the Samians, flying from the Medes, possessed Zancle. This business of the Medes, the Examiner says, *Dr. B. calls Xerxes's expedition; as if the Medes had never made an incursion upon Greece till the time of Xerxes* (p. 127). Whether he has wilfully or innocently thus misrepresented me, I know not; but if he had compared my words with Thucydides's, he might have spared this little cavil. *Not long after, οὐ πολλῷ ὕστερον,* says Thucydides, *that the Samians, who had fled from the Medes, possessed Zancle, Anaxilas beat them out of it.* My own words are, *That, at the time of Xerxes's expedition, Anaxilas took Zancle.* Now, how could Mr. B. infer from hence, that I took the Samians' affair with the Medes to be Xerxes's expedition? On the contrary, they must needs be different; for it was *at the time* of the one, and *not long after* the other. And it was an inference which I made, that, if it was *not long after* the first (Olymp. LXX. 3.), it was likely to be *at* or *about* the latter (Ol. LXXV. 1). But the reason our Examiner gives is pretty remarkable; *as if the Medes had never made an incursion upon* GREECE *before:* which implies, that he took the Medes' affair with the Samians to be an invasion upon Greece; but it was only upon the Ionians and the Asiatic towns, when Miletus was taken.

He says, *Herodotus contradicts the story that Thucydides tells* (p. 127); which I have already disproved: *that Anaxilas assisted the Samians to take Zancle;* which he did not, but only *advised* them to attempt it: *that he will deal ingenuously, and give my authorities all the force that they will bear;* and yet he quite drops that of Thucydides, the

[e] Laërt. V. Xenoph.

most positive and full of all that I had produced. He has spent two pages in a sort of declamation, to dress up and to varnish the story of Pausanias (p. 129, 130); which he may now be pleased to call home again, for he may have need of such declaiming eloquence to excuse his own errors. *He supposes, that I keep by me in reserve those synchronisms and concurrences* (p. 130) that fix the age of Anaxilas: and now, to oblige him, I have produced some of them; but have a few still behind, that shall be at his service. And I hope he'll be so kind, in requital, as *to throw into the scale those half a dozen* he speaks of, *besides his Scaligers and Petavius's, that have fallen in with the account of Pausanias* (p. 131). The more *he throws into his scale*, the greater compliment he will make me; by telling the world that I have hit upon the truth, where so many and such great men have failed before me.

There's another small controversy upon this topic between the Examiner and me, that must be debated before we conclude this section. I had observed, that the pretended Phalaris in one Epistle mentions the Zanclæans, and in another the Messenians. Now, if historians say true, that the name of Zancle was changed into Messana after Olymp. LXX., the Tyrant Phalaris, that died at Olymp. LVII., could not call them Messenians; or, if Pausanias say true, that Zancle was called Messana at Olymp. XXIX., then the Tyrant, that lived above C. years after, could not call them Zanclæans: choose which way you will, therefore, the *Epistles* are a cheat. The first part of this dilemma we have sufficiently established; but to the latter Mr. B. has made an exception, that shall here be considered.

He observes very acutely, that the *Epistles* do not expressly say Zancle *the town*, but only *the people* Zanclæans (p. 126): and he conceives, that though Zancle was called Messana at Olymp. XXIX. according to Pausanias, yet there were Zanclæans left still, and might be called so by Phalaris, at Olymp. LVII. If the author of the *Letters* had named *the*

town, he would not have justified him; but nothing can be justly inferred to his disadvantage from his naming *the people*.

This is so ingenious a distinction, that I desire *to borrow it of him for one moment*, and apply it to a passage of his author Pausanias. He has *borrowed* several things of me, and I hope he won't take it ill if I once use the same freedom with him. Pausanias, among other donaries at Olympia, describes a statue of Hercules fighting with an Amazon. The man that dedicated it was Evagoras a ZANCLÆAN,[f] and the workman one Aristocles a Cydonian. *Now the age*, says he, *of this Aristocles cannot be exactly known; but 'tis evident that he lived before Zancle was called, as it now is, Messana.*[g] Now, Mr. B. may tell Pausanias, that his inference, like mine, is very erroneous; for, the town Zancle not being named here, but only *Ζάγκλιος*, a ZANCLÆAN, he cannot infer, as he does, about the age of Aristocles; because Evagoras might be a Zanclæan long after the name of Zancle was changed into Messana. What now has Pausanias to say for himself? for it is plain that he was not aware of the Examiner's distinction. When Pausanias's friends will condescend to give an answer to so poor a cavil, the same apology will serve both for him and myself.

Mr. B. has another passage of the same Pausanias, by which he will make it appear that there were a people Zanclæans, when there was no city Zancle. *Pausanias*, says he, *where he observes, that during the Messenians' absence from Peloponnese, but two of their nation, Leontiscus and Symmachus, Messenians of Sicily, won the prize at the Olympics; adds, that the Sicilians say these were not Messenians, but descended from the old Zanclæans.*[h] *This implies*, says Mr. B.,

[f] Paus. 175. Εὐαγόρας γένος Ζάγκλιος.

[g] Δῆλα δὲ, ὡς πρότερον ἔτι ἐγένετο, πρὶν ἢ τῇ Ζάγκλῃ τὸ ὄνομα γενέσθαι τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῶν Μεσσήνην.

[h] Paus. 179. Εἶναι δὲ οἱ Σικελιῶται καὶ τούτους τῶν ἀρχαίων Ζαγκλαίων, καὶ οὐ Μεσσηνίους φασί.

that the Zanclæans kept their families unmixed with their new conquerors (p. 126). But I am sure this argument *implies* that Mr. B. has not read his System of Logic so well as he ought to do. For allow him that the families were unmixed for a while; does that *imply* that those families had still the name of Zanclæans? Is it not evident from Pausanias himself, that Leontiscus and Symmachus registered themselves MESSENIANS at Olympia?[i] But, if the old name was still kept up, why did they not style themselves ZANCLÆANS? The Catalogue of the *Stadionicæ* enters this Symmachus at Ol. LXXXVIII. *Ὀλυμπ. ὀγδοηκοστὴ ὀγδοη. Σύμμαχος Μεσσήνιος στάδιον.* Here, we see, he is recorded a Messenian, and not a Zanclæan. Nay, I think the passage of Pausanias does more than *imply* that there were none called Zanclæans in Symmachus's time; for he says *he was descended of the* ANCIENT *Zanclæans.* As if I should say, Mr. B. is descended from the *ancient Picts*, would this imply that there is now a nation called *Picts*, or rather the quite contrary?

But pray how does Mr. B. prove that *the Zanclæan families continued unmixed?* Because the Sicilians could know that Leontiscus and Symmachus were descended from them? But this is *a consequence too nearly related to some we have lately parted with* (p. 126). For we have seen already that Symmachus's age was Olymp. LXXXVIII. And Leontiscus's was about the same time, or before it. For his statue was made by Pythagoras Rheginus,[j] who, as Pliny says, lived Olymp. LXXXVII.,[k] but, as Pausanias says, made the statue of Euthymus, who got the prize at the Olympics, Olymp. LXXVII.[l] Now, the remotest of these Olympiads is but L. years from Anaxilas's time, who changed the name of Zancle into Messana. So that, for aught Mr. B. knows, both Leontiscus's and Symmachus's parents might be married before the time of that change: and where then is his consequence, *that the families continued unmixed?* Nay,

[i] *Λεόντισκος καὶ Σύμμαχος τῶν ἐπὶ πορθμῷ Μεσσηνίων.*
[j] Paus. p. 181. [k] Plin. xxxiv. 8. [l] Paus. p. 183.

although the interval had been much longer, yet the Sicilians might easily guess that those two were not descended from the Messenians of Peloponnesus, because, in truth, there was no such colony of Messenians that had settled at Zancle, as Pausanias believed. For though the name was given by Anaxilas in memory of his ancient country, yet the people that he planted there were *a medley of several countries*.[m]

His next argument to prove that *the Zanclæans continued many ages in a distinct body, and under the old name*, after the city was called Messana, is taken out of Diodorus, *who tells us*, says Mr. B., *that in the* LXXIX. *Olympiad the Zanclæans recovered their city out of those strangers' hands that had possessed it so many years* (p. 126). So many years? Pray how many had they possessed it, according to Diodorus? Anaxilas, that changed the name of Zancle, died, as he says,[n] at Olymp. LXXVI. 1. And his children were dispossessed of it at Ol. LXXIX. 4.[o] Which is but the short interval of XV. years. What does the Examiner mean, then, by his *so many years*, and *continuing many ages?* I'll open the case a little, and shew his mistake; for I am persuaded he is very innocent in this place, and does not wilfully deceive his readers. Diodorus says the Zanclæans recovered their liberty at Olymp. LXXIX. 4. This the Examiner took notice of; and at the same time there run in his head the account of Pausanias, that the Zanclæans lost their liberty Olymp. XXIX. 1. The gentleman, out of his great circumspection, tacks these two accounts together, and argues from them, as if Diodorus espoused them both. But I have already shewn that Pausanias's date differs from Diodorus's almost two whole centuries. There is nothing therefore in Diodorus about *possessing it so many years*. That's the Examiner's commentary upon the text. His words are only these: at Olymp. LXXIX. 4. Ῥηγῖνοι μετὰ Ζαγκλαίων, *the Rhegians with the Zanclæans drove out the sons of Anaxilas,*

[m] Σύμμικτοι ἄνθρωποι. Thucyd. [n] Diod. p. 37. [o] P. 58.

and freed their countries from their tyranny. The Rhegians had been under the tyranny of Anaxilas and his children for the space of XXXII. years only, and the Zanclæans not so long. Which is the true reason why Diodorus here calls them ZANCLÆANS, though the town was then called Messana. *The Zanclæans,* says he, *delivered their country.* Because they were really the very same persons that were formerly called Zanclæans. For the same generation saw both revolutions; both the conquest of their city by Anaxilas, and the recovery of it from his children. This once, therefore, he calls them Zanclæans; but ever after they are Messenians, and the town is Messana; as at Ol. XCI. 2.,[p] XCII. 4.,[q] XCVI. 1.[r] So in Herodotus's time, about Olymp. LXXXIII., 'twas not Zancle, but Messana. And when Thucydides relates the Athenian invasion of Sicily, Ol. XCI. 2., he talks all along of Messana and the Messenians; never naming Zancle, but once only, when he was treating of the antiquities of the country.

But we are sure, says Mr. B., *the Zanclæans preserved themselves in a separate body even till Pliny's time, who expressly distinguishes them from the Messenians, and tells us Messana was a free city, but the Zanclæans were tributaries* (p. 126, 127).[s] The first Edition of Mr. B.'s Book has only a reference to the passage of Pliny; but the second thus sets down the words in the margin: *Messana civium Romanorum, qui Mamertini vocantur, Latinæ conditionis, Zanclæi.* Thus, as I say, the words of Pliny are cited in the margin. But the passage of Pliny is really in this manner: *Intus* Latinæ conditionis *Centuripini, Netini, Segestani.* Stipendiarii, *Assorini, Ætnenses,* (and so through the whole alphabet, to) *Zanclæi Messeniorum in Siculo Freto.* Here I think 'tis as plain as the sun, that Mr. B., the writer of the first Edition, took *stipendiarii* in Pliny to signify *tributaries,* as it truly does; but the marginal writer in the second Edition believed that

[p] Diod. p. 136.
[q] P. 185.
[r] P. 282, 297.
[s] Lib. iii. c. 8.

Latinæ conditionis signified *tributaries;* and that *stipendiarii,* like the other words on each side of it, was the name of a people of Sicily. Which I think, without any aggravation, to be a brace of such monstrous and infamous blunders, as can hardly be matched again but by him that made these. But that which troubles me more is this, that the learned Mr. B., in his letter from Paris, before the second Edition, gives out all those alterations, of which this is one, to be his own. Now, how shall we reconcile these matters together? for the text, we see, looks one way, and the margin another. If Mr. B. be a man of honour and veracity, as he is, he made this marginal note: if he be a man of wit and judgment, as he is too, it's impossible he should make it. Here's a terrible quarrel between his honour and his judgment; and I could wish the matter was fairly ended: I have this expedient to offer towards it, that the text being writ at London, and the margin at Paris, may perhaps be a physical account why the sense of them is so wide asunder.

But what do I say to the passage of Pliny? Why, I will give Mr. B. an answer, when he pleases to tell me the meaning of it. Cluverius, a man of learning and other abilities not much inferior to Mr. B., knew not what to make of it. *Hinc mirâ brevitate,* says he, *et historiarum confusione Plinius, Zanclæi Messeniorum in Siculo Freto.*[t] This great man, it seems, could see nothing in it but *darkness* and *confusion.* But I have the less reason to be concerned about it, because I have plainly shewed that Pausanias is quite out in his reckoning; so that I do not charge it as the Sophist's error, that he names the Zancleans (which Pliny is cited for), but that he talks of Messenians, who were not heard of in Sicily in the days of the true Phalaris.

And so much about the Zanclæans. For I hope this article is sufficiently settled. And I would make bold to ask my learned Examiner, *the next time he and I talk together* (p. 131), if he still retains his loyalty to his *Sicilian prince*

[t] Sicil. Antiq. p. 81.

(p. 43). If he does, much good may it do him: he shall adore his Perkin Warbeck as long as he pleases.

V.

That same XCII. Letter, which has furnished us already with one detection of the imposture, will, if strictly examined, make a second confession, from these words, ὃς αὐτοὺς ἐκτρίψω πίτυος δίκην: 'tis a threat of Phalaris to the Himeræans, *That he would extirpate them like a pine-tree.* Now, here again am I concerned for our Sophist, that he is thus taken tripping. For the original of this saying is thus related by Herodotus:[a] when the Lampsaceni in Asia had taken captive Miltiades the Athenian, Crœsus king of Lydia sent them a message; That, if they did not set him free, he would come and *extirpate them like a pine;* σφέας πίτυος τρόπον ἀπείλεε ἐκτρίψειν. The men of Lampsacus understood not the meaning of that expression, *like a pine;* till one of the eldest of them hit upon it, and told them, That *of all trees, the pine, when once it is cut down, never grows again, but utterly perishes.* We see the phrase was then so new and unheard of, that it puzzled a whole city. Now, if Crœsus was upon that occasion the first author of this saying, what becomes of this Epistle? For this, as I observed before, being pretended to be written above a dozen years before Phalaris's death, carries date at least half a dozen before Crœsus began his reign.

Nay, there is good ground of suspicion that He-

[a] Lib. vi. cap. 37.

rodotus himself, who wrote an hundred years after Phalaris was killed, was the first broacher of this expression. For 'tis known, those first historians make every body's speeches for them. So that the blunder of our Sophist is so much the more shameful. The third [fourth] chapter of the VIII. book of A. Gellius, which is now lost, carried this title, *Quòd Herodotus ....parùm verè dixerit, unam solamque pinum arborum omnium cæsam nunquam denuò ex iisdem radicibus pullulare,* "That Herodotus is in the wrong in saying, "that of all trees, a pine only, if lopt, never grows "again." I suppose, Gellius, in that chapter, told us, out of Theophrastus,[v] of some other trees, beside the pine, that perish by lopping; the pitch-tree, the fir, the palm, the cedar, and the cypress. But I would have it observed, that he attributes the saying, and the mistake about it, not to Crœsus, but to Herodotus; after whom it became a proverb, which denotes an utter destruction, without any possibility of flourishing again. See πεύκης τρόπον in Zenobius, Diogenianus, and Suidas. And 'tis remarkable that our letter-monger has Herodotus's very words, πίτυς and ἐκτρίψειν; when all the other three writers have πεύκη for πίτυς, and κόπτειν instead of ἐκτρίβειν; which shews he had in his eye and memory this very place of Herodotus. A strange piece of stupidity, or else contempt of his readers, to pretend to assume the garb and person of Phalaris, and yet knowingly to put words in his mouth not heard of till a whole century after him.

[v] Hist. Pl. lib. iv. c. 19. Caus. Pl. l. v. c. 24. Pl. l. xvii. c. 24.

Mr. B. goes on, and begins his remarks upon this article with his common-place eloquence, about the uncertainty of this way of proof from sentences and sayings (p. 134). In his opinion, his *Sicilian prince* may make use of the very phrases, not the thoughts only, but the expressions too, of Herodotus, Euripides, and others, and yet come a whole century or two before them. This, as weak and absurd as it is, shall not pass without an answer, in a place that is more proper for it than this.

He asks, *How do I prove that the expression puzzled the whole city?* And he answers himself, *Plainly! because one of the eldest citizens hit upon't, and told the meaning of it. This is very nice reasoning* (p. 135). If he was half as nice in his representing, he would not fill his papers with such mean and unworthy frauds as he would put upon his readers; if any of whom will but look upon my words, as they stand in the *Dissertation,* they will see his fair dealing. They are the express words of Herodotus, that the whole city was *puzzled* a good while,[w] even the old man himself, who at last, *with much ado,* found out the meaning.[x]

I had observed, *that the first historians make every body's speeches for them.* Mr. B. takes me up; *for this of Crœsus is no speech, but only a message* (p. 135). Wonderful exactness! Pray, Sir, accommodate us out of your new Logic with a definition of a message. I thought formerly, that *a message was a speech sent:* and when Neptune rebukes the Winds in Virgil,

> *Maturate fugam, regique hæc dicite vestro,*
> *Non illi imperium pelagi, &c.* [*Æn.* i. 137.]

I believed it was both a speech and a message at once. And surely there are infinite such in poets, and historians, and common life. Nay, Herodotus's own phrase is a sufficient warrant for me; for he says, that *Crœsus* SPOKE *to the Lampsaceni by a messenger.*[y]

[w] Πλανωμένων δὲ Λαμψακηνῶν.

[x] Μόγις κοτὲ μαθών.

[y] Πέμπων προσηγόρευε. [προηγόρευε—D.]

But 'tis probable, said I, that Herodotus *invented this phrase himself.* Here Mr. B. insults, and briskly asks me these questions: *Does Herodotus tell us that the Lampsacenes were puzzled with an expression invented by Herodotus? Were the men of Lampsacus in Crœsus's time at a loss to understand a phrase, that was not thought of till Herodotus* 100 *years afterwards coined it? 'Tis wonderful to me, how such a piece of reasoning as this could ever enter into a head that has brains in it* (p. 136). Who can deny, but that the wit of this expression is as great as the civility of it? But, to let that pass, I am afraid it would not much tend to the Examiner's reputation, if the world should determine from this very passage, whether his own head be so very full of brains as he and I think it is.

The falseness of his reasoning lies open enough. I argued from a double supposition: first, if Herodotus give us the very words of Crœsus, they are six years at least younger than the Epistle pretends to be: or, secondly, if Herodotus, as his and other historians' custom is, fathered a saying upon Crœsus, which he invented himself, then it is a hundred years younger than the Epistle. Now our Examiner, in his wisdom, tacks both these together; and disputes, as if I had maintained that both parts of the dilemma were true at once; that both Crœsus used the expression, and Herodotus invented it! Was there ever such *a piece of reasoning* to be met with in print, till his *Examination* blessed the world, and furnished it with store of them?

To shew Mr. B. a picture of his reasoning in a light that is clearer. Homer makes Achilles's speeches for him, just as, according to my opinion, Herodotus makes Crœsus's. And the learned world has all along considered some passages in those speeches as the inventions of Homer. *Say you so, gentlemen?* starts up our Examiner: *does Homer tell us that Agamemnon was affronted with an expression invented by Homer? Were the men of Troy frightened with language that was not thought of till Homer five hundred years*

afterward coined it? 'Tis wonderful to me, Sirs, how such a piece of reasoning as this could ever enter into heads that have brains in them. This is a true representation of the Examiner's argument; and I might tell him, in another of his civil phrases, *That surely the man that writ this must have been fast asleep, for else he could never have talked so wildly* (p. 137). But I hear of a greater paradox talked of abroad; that not the *wild* only, but the *best* part of the Examiner's Book may possibly have been writ while he was *fast asleep.*

Mr. B. goes on; *If Herodotus is to be believed, Crœsus used this expression; if he is not, why is he brought to prove any thing?* (p. 137.) Wonderful again! By the same way of reasoning, he may ruin at one blow the reputation of Thucydides, Xenophon, Livy, Sallust, and almost all the historians. For their manner is, before their speeches, to say, *Such a one spoke thus and thus, in these very words:* though every body knows they are the historian's own speeches; and it happens not seldom, that into the mouth of the same person, and on the very same occasion, one historian puts one speech, and another a quite different one. Now, to argue in our Examiner's words; *If Thucydides be to be believed, Pericles used such expressions; if he is not, why is he brought to prove any thing?* By the same way, he may cashier Xenophon, and the rest. And we are in danger of losing the noblest parts of ancient history, if Mr. B. be not merciful, and put his syllogism into its sheath again.

But would Crœsus, who expected his message should immediately be obeyed, put it into such a phrase as they were not likely to apprehend? (p. 137.) If this argument had any force in it, it would fall upon Herodotus himself, who expressly says that the message *was sent,* and yet was *hardly* understood. The Lampsacenes understood in general the import of the message: Miltiades was to be set free; or else they were to be extirpated. The word *ἐκτρίψειν* alone implied some terrible threat; for to be *cut down,* like any tree whatsoever, was a vengeance severe enough. But the

metaphor πίτυος δίκην was not plain to them at first; why a *pine*, rather than any other tree. However, this would not have defeated the design of the message, had the Lampsacenes never found the reason of that metaphor: but we see they did hit upon't, after they had cast about for't; which is a full justification of Herodotus from this cavil of the Examiner.

The command, we see, was clear enough, that they should release Miltiades; but the threat had something of dark in it. And this is censured by Mr. B. as a piece of absurd management. But see the difference among great wits. For Demetrius, in his elegant book of *Rhetoric*,[z] extols the conduct of Dionysius of Syracuse in a case exactly like this. He sent a message to the Locrians, *That they should do such a thing, or else their cicadæ*[a] *should sing upon the ground.* A command plain and express, but a threat new and obscure: and perhaps, as the facetious Examiner has it, *it might puzzle the mayor and aldermen, nay, and the recorder too* of Locri (p. 135). *Now, there's something great in allegory*, says Demetrius, *especially when it's used in threatenings: as when Dionysius said*, that their cicadæ should sing upon the ground. *For if he had said plainly*, That he would ravage their country, and destroy their wood, *he had appeared more angry and less terrible. But he used the allegory, as it were a covering to his threat. For a threat that has a hidden meaning is so much the more dreadful; one man apprehending one thing, and another another.* Aristotle[b] attributes this saying to Stesichorus; but that difference is not material. 'Tis enough that he agrees with Demetrius in his character of it, that it is no less *ingenious* than *enigmatical*.[c] And has not Mr. B., then, a particular taste about good sense and decorum?

Gellius, as I remarked, ascribes that saying to Herodotus

[z] Περὶ Ἑρμηνείας.

[a] Τέττιγες, which sing upon the tops of trees, not our English grasshoppers.

[b] De Rhet. lib. ii. and iii.

[c] Ἀστεῖον, αἰνιγματικόν.

himself, and not to Crœsus: Mr. B.'s answer is, That Gellius might not speak accurately, nor *nicely examine* what he was about: which is an excuse fitter for the crude pieces of one that I know, than so exact a writer's as Gellius. But, besides him, Eustathius says, "That ἐχεπευκὲς in Homer "signifies *deadly*;[d] because πεύκη, the pitch-tree, when "once it is cut down, grows no more. We must take "notice, therefore, says he, of that saying of Herodotus;[e] "*That a pine, of all trees, will not grow again after the* "*felling*. For, if the pitch-tree and cypress live no more "after they are cut down, how comes Herodotus to say this "of the pine-tree alone?" Here's another author, we see, that was no *nicer* than Gellius: and Mr. B. perhaps will be no nicer towards them, but roundly tell them, as his plain manner is, that both their heads had *no brains in them*.

But, before he quits his hold, he will have one fling at my translation of Gellius; *Pinum cæsam*, in my language *a pine-tree lopt*. *This*, says he, *is falsely rendered, instead of* cut down. *For that a pine-tree perishes by lopping, is news to the naturalists* (p. 136). To such *naturalists* as I have to deal with, I believe it may be news; but not to those that have read either Pliny or Theophrastus. *Lopping*, says Pliny, *is fatal to the cypress, the pitch-tree, and the cedar. For these die if the top be lopt of, or burnt with fire.*[f] The other says, *That the beech, the pitch-tree, the pine, the palm, and, as some say, the cedar and cypress, die with lopping, κατὰ τὴν ἐπικοπήν. And that is termed ἐπικοπὴ* (lopping), *when the side-branches are stript, and the top is cut off.*[g] This, it seems, is *news* to the Examiner; I hope, therefore, I shall have his thanks for it, for I have a great deal more to tell him, before I take my leave of him.

One of the main things that I here pointed at, as a plain detection of the Sophist, was his using the very expression of Herodotus, πίτυος δίκην ἐκτρίβειν; when some others

[d] Eustath. ad Iliad. p. 32. [*ed. Basil.*—D.]

[e] Τὸ τοῦ Ἡροδότου.

[f] Plin. xvii. 24. Decacuminatio.

[g] Theoph. de Caus. v. 24.

that mentioned the proverb yet differed a little in the phrase, having it πεύκης τρόπον κόπτειν. This I observed as a plain token that he had Herodotus's passage in his eye; as Eustathius, when he brings that saying, expressly cites him for it.[h] And so Ælian appears to have had him in his thoughts when he says, τὸ δαιμόνιον .... παραχρῆμα ἐκτρίβον τυράννους πίτυος δίκην.[i] Now, the Examiner, that he might do one discreet thing in this chapter, has dropt this, and taken no notice of it. And he was *tempted*, he says, *to leave this whole part of my* Dissertation *unexamined* (p. 134). An innocent temptation indeed! How much better had he yielded to it, than have made such miserable work both with logic and critic!

VI.

In the LXXXV. Epistle we have already taken notice of our mock-tyrant's triumph; ὅτι Ταυρομενείτας καὶ Ζαγκλείους εἰς τέλος νενίκηκε, *That he had utterly routed the Tauromenites and the Zanclæans.* But there's an old and true saying, Πολλὰ καινὰ τοῦ πολέμου, *Many new and strange things happen in war.* For we have just now seen those same routed Zanclæans rise up again, after a thousand years, to give him a worse defeat. And now the others too are taking their turn, to revenge their old losses. For these, though they are called *Tauromenites* both here and in the XV., XXXI., and XXXIII. Epistles, make protestation against the name, and declare they were called *Naxians* in the days of the true Phalaris. *Taurominium, quæ anteà Naxos,* says Pliny:[j] *Taurominium, quam prisci Naxon vocabant,* says Solinus.[k] Whence

[h] P. 82. [i] Var. Hist. vi. 13. [j] Plin. iii. 8.
[k] Solin. c. xi. ["colonia Taurominia, quam," &c. cap. v. *ed. Salm.*—D.]

it is that Herodotus and Thucydides, because they writ before the change of the name, never speak of Taurominium, but of Naxos and the Naxians. A full account of the time, and the reason, and the manner of the change, is thus given by Diodorus.[l] Some Sicilians planted themselves, Olymp. XCVI. 1., upon a hill called Taurus, near the ruins of Naxus, and built a new town there, which they called *Tauromenion, ἀπὸ τοῦ Ταῦρος καὶ μένειν*, from *their settlement upon Taurus.* About forty years after this, Olymp. CV. 3., one Andromachus, a Tauromenite, gathered all the remnant of the old Naxians that were dispersed through Sicily, and persuaded them to fix there.[m] This is such a plain and punctual testimony, that neither the power and stratagems of the Tyrant, nor the rhetoric of the Sophist, are able to evade it. Where are those, then, that cry up Phalaris for the florid author of the *Letters?* who was burnt in his own Bull above CL. years before Taurominium was ever thought on.

But I shall not omit one thing in defence of the *Epistles,* which, though it will not do the work, let it go, however, as far as it can. We have allowed that Pythagoras was contemporary with Phalaris; and yet, in the history of that philosopher, we are told of his conversation and exploits at Taurominium. Porphyry says, *He delivered Croton, and Himera, and Taurominium from tyrants:*[n] and, *That in one and the same day he was at Metapontium in Italy, and Taurominium in Sicily.*[o] The same story is told by Jam-

[l] Lib. xiv. p. 282.
[m] Lib. xv. p. 411.
[n] Vita Pythag. p. 169. *καὶ Ταυρομένιον.*
[o] P. 192 and 193.

blichus,[p] who supplies us too with another; *That a young man of Taurominium being drunk, Pythagoras played him sober by a few tunes of grave spondees.*[q] Conon also tells a story, *How a certain Milesian left his country in the time of Cyrus, and went to Taurominium in Sicily.*[r] These several passages seem to concur with, and confirm the credit of, the *Letters;* that Taurominium had a name and being in the time of Pythagoras and Phalaris. All this would be very plausible, and our Sophist might come off with a whole skin, but for a cross figure in his own art, *rhetoric,* called *prolepsis,* or *anticipation;* viz. when poets or historians call any place by a name which was not yet known in the times they write of. As when Virgil says of Æneas,

—— Lavinaque venit
Littora —— [i. 2.]

and of Dædalus,

Chalcidicâque levis tandem super adstitit arce;
[vi. 17.]

he is excused by *prolepsis,* though those places were not yet called so in the times of Dædalus and Æneas. The same excuse we may make for Ovid, when he tells us that Taurominium, and Himera, and Agrigentum, were as old as the rape of Proserpine;

Himeraque, et Didymen, Acragantaque, Tauromenenque.[s]

[p] Jamb. p. 128. [q] P. 109. Ταυρομενείτου μειρακίου.
[r] Conon. Narrat. 38. Εἰς τὸ ἐν Σικελίᾳ Ταυρομένιον.
[s] iv. Fast. v. 475.

So, when Porphyry and Jamblichus name Taurominium in the story of Pythagoras, and Conon in the story of his Milesian, meaning Naxos, which was afterwards called so, the same figure acquits them. For 'tis no more than when I say, *Julius Cæsar conquered France, and made an expedition into England;* though I know that Gaul and Britain were the names in that age. But when Phalaris mentions Taurominium so many generations before it was heard of, he cannot have the benefit of that same *prolepsis.* For this is not a poetical, but a prophetical anticipation. And he must either have had the prescience and divination of the Sibyls, or his *Epistles* are as false and commentitious as our *Sibylline Oracles.*

Mr. B. is pleased to object, *That Diodorus is in two stories about the founding of Taurominium. In one place he says, the Sicilians first called it Taurominium Olymp.* XCVI. 1.; *in another, that Andromachus named it so about* XL. *years after. Either of these accounts, he confesses, would serve my purpose; but since they contradict one another, neither of them is to be depended on* (p. 132). That's hard indeed. What, neither of them to be depended on? Not so much as this to be concluded from them, that at least the city was not built above CL. years before the earlier date of the two? This is just such a strain of reasoning as he treated us with in the last section. The best refutation of such arguments is, not to answer them, but to use them: for, by a short trial they shew their bad metal, and quickly lose their edge. Let us make, therefore, an experiment or two. There are different accounts about the year of our Saviour's nativity; and, *since they contradict one another, neither of them is to be depended on;* so that we cannot justly infer from them, that he was not as old as the Mac-

cabees. Some say Alæsa in Sicily was built by Archonides, Olymp. XCIV. 2.;[t] but others say, by the Carthaginians, Olymp. XCIII. 4. These stories *contradict one another, and neither can be depended on;* therefore the town may be as old as Troy. One man told me in company, that the Examiner was XXIV. years old; and another said XXV. Now, *these two stories contradict one another, and neither can be depended on;* we are at liberty, therefore, to believe him a person of about L. years of age.

As for the two stories of Diodorus, I believed the former was the true one; and therefore I represented the latter so as to make it consistent with it. Cluverius, indeed, prefers the latter account; but I cannot yet be of his opinion, because Diodorus calls the place *Taurominium* at Olymp. XCVI. 1.,[u] and XCVI. 3.,[v] and XCVII. 1.,[w] three several times before Andromachus is mentioned.

But there were people of old that inhabited the hilly parts about Naxos, where Taurominium stood (p. 132). Right again; and therefore Taurominium was built long before Diodorus's date of it. I'll make bold to *use* this argument too; and that will serve for an *answer*. Arrian, in his *History of Alexander*,[x] has the face to tell the world, that that prince built Alexandria at Mount Caucasus. *But there were people of old that inhabited those hilly parts,* as that writer himself confesses; Ἐπῴκεῖτο πολλοῖς ἀνθρώποις,[y] *The mountain,* says he, *had many inhabitants.* 'Tis plain, then, that there was an Alexandria at Caucasus before ever the Macedonian set foot there. Is not Arrian cut down now with this mighty argument? And which of the historians may not be in the same condition when a fit of disputing takes the Examiner?

Ay, but the people might be called Tauromenites before the city was built; and 'tis observable, that Phalaris names the people, but not the city; nor uses any such expression as im-

[t] Diod. p. 246.
[u] Diod. p. 282.
[v] [p.] 305.
[w] [p.] 309, 310.
[x] Lib. iii. p. 230.
[y] Ib. p. 231.

plies they were formed into a politic body, or belonged to any city (p. 133). I remember Mr. B. says somewhere, *that there's a quaintness of pedantry in some observations.* He might have *observed* too, if he had pleased, that Phalaris mentions the Syracusians, but never names the place Syracuse: must the Syracusians therefore *belong to no city?* If so small an observation can raze cities at this rate, the Tyrant, by Mr. B.'s conduct, will be more terrible now than when he was alive.

The reason why he mentioned not the place Taurominium, but only the people, is no secret at all. For he neither took the town, nor besieged it, nor carried his Bull thither for a raree-show, nor had any other concerns there; and why then should he mention it? The people, indeed, he had some transactions with; for he says,[z] *They began an unjust war with him; they redeemed their captives by a price in common; and he remitted to them that price in common, at the request of Stesichorus.* And surely this is a hint broad enough that they were *formed into a politic body, and belonged to a city.* Unless Mr. B. will have nothing less *than the mayor, and aldermen, and recorder,** to be named for a proof that it was a city.

Mr. B. adds a passage of Vibius Sequester; *That Taurominium had its name from the river Taurominius, that runs by it.* And he infers, *that there might be a people Tauromenites, as well as a river Taurominius, before there was a city Taurominium* (p. 133). The gentleman loves to surprise us with a consequence: *A river Taurominius;* ergo, *a people Tauromenites.* Now, if the Tauromenites were a sort of fish, this argument drawn from the *river* would be of great force. But, with submission to Mr. B.'s better judgment, I humbly conceive the Tauromenites were flesh and blood like the rest of the Sicilians.

But the Examiner's expression deserves our remarking; *If Vibius Sequester be to be credited* (p. 133). I doubt not

[z] Ep. 3. 33.

[* See p. 230.—D.]

but he tacitly answered himself, that he is not to be credited. For Mr. B. appears to have had this notice of Vibius from Cluverius in his *Sicily*;[a] but with great candour and integrity he suppresses what Cluverius proves there; *That Vibius is quite mistaken; for the river had that name from the town, and not the town from the river; which was called, not Taurominius, but Onabala, till after the time of Augustus*, that is, till cccc. years after the date of Taurominium.

The words of Vibius Sequester are these: *Taurominius, inter Syracusas et Messanam, à quo oppidum Taurominium; quod oppidum aliter Euseboneora dicitur.*[b] It had become Mr. B.'s great learning to have cited this passage at large, and have given the world an emendation of it. The fault, I suppose, is manifest enough; for who ever heard of *Euseboneora?* Cluverius endeavours to correct it, *Eusebio Naxos.* I will give no character of that learned man's correction, but only propose another of my own, which is, *Eusebon Cora.* The author meant *Εὐσεβῶν Χώρα, Regio Piorum;* a place so called in the neighbourhood of Taurominium and Catana, from the famous story of the two *pious brothers*, who, upon an eruption of Ætna, when the liquid fiery mass ran down towards their dwelling, took their aged parents in their arms, and escaped with them, neglecting all their own goods and treasure. Conon gives us a narrative of it, which he closes with this, *That the Sicilians from that occasion called the place ΕΥΣΕΒΩΝ ΧΩΡΑ, the Place of the Pious.*[c] Lycurgus the orator tells the same story; and adds, *That from thence the place was yet called ΕΥΣΕΒΩΝ ΧΩΡΟΣ.*[d] Aristotle,[e] Strabo,[f] and Pausanias,[g] call those brothers *ΕΥΣΕΒΕΙΣ;* and Claudian, Pii Fratres:[h] and Solinus names the place Campus Piorum.[i] Ælian says,[j] this eruption

[a] Cluv. Sicil. p. 90, 91.
[b] Vib. Sequester de Fluviis.
[c] Conon. Nar. 43. *Διὰ ταῦτα οἱ Σικελιῶται τὸν χῶρον ἐκεῖνον Εὐσεβῶν χώραν ἐκάλεσαν.*
[d] Lycurg. contra Leocrat. p. 60.
[e] Arist. *Θαυμ.*
[f] Strabo, vi.
[g] Pausan. Phoc.
[h] Claud. Epig. 35.
[i] Solin. c. 5.
[j] Æl. apud Stob. Serm. 77.

happened at Olymp. LXXXI.; but I suspect there's a mistake in the number.

To return now to the subject under debate; we have other evidence unquestionable, that confirms the narrative of Diodorus about the origin of Taurominium. For Pliny and Solinus say expressly, *That Taurominium was the city which was formerly called Naxos.* Taurominium, therefore, cannot be older than the destruction of Naxos. But we are certain that that city was destroyed by Dionysius of Syracuse, at Olymp. XCIV. 2.[k] And seven years after, says Diodorus, Taurominium was founded, Ol. XCVI. 1. The whole account is clear, and every part of it is consistent with, and confirmed by, the rest. And agreeably to this, Herodotus[l] calls the city *Naxos*, and the inhabitants *Naxians*, about Olymp. LXX.; and so does Thucydides at Olymp. XCI. 2.[m] Nay, the very medals of the Tauromenites are an infallible proof that they came from the Naxians: there are five several pieces in Paruta that have on one side *ΤΑΥΡΟΜΕΝΙΤΑΝ*; on the reverse, Apollo's head with an inscription *ΑΡΧΑΓΕΤΑ*. Now, Apollo Ἀρχαγέτας was the tutelar god of the Naxians. *The Chalcidians of Eubœa*, says Thucydides,[n] *founded Naxos, and built an altar to Apollo Archagetas; which is yet standing, on the outside of the town.* And we have Appian's testimony,[o] that the Tauromenites were under the patronage of the same *Archagetas; the very same that had an altar and statue built by the Naxians.* But the original money of the Tauromenites is a surer evidence of it; and 'tis allowed by all antiquaries that the inscription is in memory of their Naxian ancestors.

Our Examiner hinted at this objection against the *Epistles*, from the date of Taurominium, in his Preface to Phalaris. And 'tis an unusual piece of moderation in him, that he has not charged me with stealing it from him. He had as good pretence to do so, as when he accuses me of *pillaging*

[k] Diod. p. 246. [l] Lib. vii. [m] Lib. vi.
[n] Lib. vi. [o] De Cicil. b. v. p. 1162.

his poor Notes, and robbing Vizzanius and Nevelett; of which hereafter. But I'll give the reader the secret why he dropt this opportunity of calling me a plagiary. Both in his Preface and his Index he says, *Naxos was destroyed by Dionysius the* YOUNGER, *as Diodorus relates it.*[p] Now, if a man dips only into Diodorus, or *casts his eye* on him, as Mr. B. says, he may possibly mistake so; because the story is touched upon in the Annals of Dionysius the younger.[q] But the truth is, that Naxos was razed by Dionysius the ELDER, at Ol. XCIV. 2.;[r] which is XXXV. years before the other came to the crown. Now, some kind Assistant, I suppose, had informed Mr. B. of this shameful flaw in his Preface;[s] and so the consciousness of his own guilt made him slip this fair occasion of traducing me. But if the reader pleases to see how each of us have managed this topic, I'll ask no other justification.

But he asks me, *Where do I find that Phalaris was burnt in his Bull?* (p. 133.) I find it in Ovid's *Ibis:*

> *Utque ferox Phalaris, linguâ prius ense resectâ,*
> *More bovis, Paphio clausus in ære, gemas;* [439.]

and in the old Scholiast upon the place; *Phalaris ipsemet resectâ linguâ in taurum æneum conjectus est.—But do you take up,* says Mr. B., *with the trifling author of the verses upon Ibis?* A little while ago, *Ovid was one of the greatest wits of the ancients, and as much above Manilius as Nireus was handsomer than Thersites* (p. 28). But now the wind is changed again, and he's *a trifling author*. Mr. B., I see, will let nobody else contradict him, but reserves that for a compliment which he'll pay to himself. But why, I pray,

[p] Post Naxum à Dionysio *juniore* dirutam.

[q] Diod. p. 411. [r] Diod. 246.

[s] I was mistaken here, when I thought the Examiner had discovered his own mistake; for he continues the blunder about Dionysius *junior*, p. 183 of his *Examination;* and is still so little sensible of it, that he tells me I borrowed the argument from him, without *making the least improvement.* [*Adden.*]

so severe upon Ovid? Why must he have no credit in a matter of history? Will Mr. B. stigmatise him for *a lie-maker by profession* (p. 164), such as he obligingly declares all *poets are akin to?* Of all the various histories that are touched on in Ovid's *Ibis*, there's not one in forty but what we have at this day other good vouchers for besides the poet himself. And, without question, he had authors for the rest, though they are not now extant. But Mr. B. requires some *grave writer's* testimony, and not *a trifling poet's* (p. 133). I had quoted a very grave and learned writer for it, Heraclides Ponticus; but he tells me, I cite him *falsely* (p. 133); or else *I use some copy of Heraclides that he has not seen* (p. 117). What Mr. B. has or has not seen, his Assistant knows better than I do. But in all the copies of Heraclides, 'tis, I think, sufficiently hinted, that Phalaris was burnt in his Bull: I mean the Greek copies; for the Latin translation, which is sometimes easier *seen* than the original, does not express it. *Phalaris*, says Heraclides, *burned several persons in his Brazen Bull; but the people took vengeance on him, and they burned his mother too, and his friends.*[t] If they burned his mother *too*, then surely that implies that Phalaris himself was burned. And, indeed, how could the Agrigentines forget to burn him? The revenge was so proper and natural, and the thought so very obvious and uppermost, that 'tis hardly credible they should not burn him in his Bull, if they had him alive in their power. Tully says, *That the whole multitude of the Agrigentines fell upon him.*[u] This is consistent enough with Ovid's account of him; for they *fell upon him*, and seized him, and so haled him to the Bull. As for Valerius Maximus, who says, *He was stoned to death, at the instigation of Zeno Eleates,*[v] 'tis plain he mistakes Phalaris for Nearchus,[w] who was Tyrant of Velia in Italy a hundred years after Phalaris. Jo. Tzetzes

[t] Herac. in Polit. Ἐνέπρησε δὲ καὶ τὴν μητέρα.
[u] De Offic. ii. 7. Universa Agrig. multitudo impetum fecit.
[v] Val. Max. iii. 3.
[w] See Laërt. in Zen. Eleate.

says, *He was starved to death in a coat of lead;*[x] but he scarce deserves our consideration; or, if he did, yet here are three authors for his *burning*, and he alone for his *starving*.

But, to take leave of this topic; let us see how the balance stands here between the Examiner and me. In the one scale there are Diodorus, Pliny, Solinus, Thucydides, Herodotus, and the original medals of Taurominium: in the Examiner's scale there are two false surmises, two vicious consequences, and one *refreshing quibble* (p. 133); for the quibble's his own by the old rule, *Qui capit, ille facit*.

VII.

The xxxv. Letter, to Polygnotus, presents us with a sentence of moral; ὅτι λόγος ἔργου σκιὰ παρὰ τοῖς σωφρονεστέροις πεπίστευται, *That wise men take words for the shadow of things;* that is, as the shadow is not alone, without the presence of the body, so words are accompanied with the action. 'Tis a very notable saying, and we are obliged to the author of it; and if Phalaris had not modestly hinted that others had said it before him, we might have taken it for his own. But then there was either a strange jumping of good wits, or Democritus was a sorry plagiary, for he laid claim to the first invention of it, as Diogenes Laërtius says; Τούτου ἔστι καὶ τὸ, λόγος ἔργου σκιή;[y] and Plutarch, Λόγος γὰρ ἔργου σκιὴ, κατὰ Δημόκριτον.[z] What shall we say to this matter? Democritus had the character of a man of probity and wit, who had neither inclination nor need to filch the sayings of others. Besides, here are Plutarch and Diogenes,

[x] Chil. p. 95. [*Chil.* v. 966. p. 194. *ed. Kiess.*—D.]
[y] Vita Democrit. [z] De Educat. Puer.

two witnesses that would scorn to flatter, and to ascribe it to Democritus, had they ever read it in others before him. This bears hard indeed upon the author of the *Letters;* but how can we help it? He should have minded his hits better, when he was minded to act the Tyrant. For Democritus, the first author of the sentence, was too young to know even Pythagoras: *τὰ τῶν χρόνων μάχεται,* says Diogenes;[a] and yet Pythagoras survived Phalaris, nay, deposed him, if we will believe his scholars. We may allow forty years' space for Democritus's writing, from the LXXXIV. Olymp. to the XCIV. in which he died. Now, the earliest of this is above an hundred years after the last period of Phalaris.

I am sensible that Michael Psellus refers this saying to Simonides;[b] and Isidorus Pelus. to the Lacedæmonians.[c] But these two are of little authority, in a case of this nature, against Plutarch and Diogenes. Neither would the matter be mended, should we accept of their testimony. For Simonides was but seven years old when Phalaris was killed. And were it a Lacedæmonian apophthegm, though the date be undetermined, it might fairly be presumed to be more recent than he.

Mr. B. animadverts, that, among the several pretenders to this sentence, *Λόγος ἔργου σκιά, I decide in favour of Democritus, for a very good reason; because otherwise it would be of no use to me in the present debate* (p. 138). One half of which words are a misrepresentation, and the other half a mistake.

I decided in favour of Democritus, not to serve a present

[a] Vita Democ. [b] De Dæm. [c] Epist. 252 and 259.

turn, but for just and perpetual reasons. There are two that ascribe it to Democritus, and but one to each of the others. Nay, I will now add a third in Democritus's behalf; *Πένταθλος, ὁ Δημόκριτος ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης, &c. Τούτου ἔστι καὶ τὸ, Λόγος ἑρμοῦ αἰκίη*;[d] which, according to the present reading, is *Oratio Mercurii flagellum*, as Wolfius and Portus translate it: but it ought to be corrected, *Λόγος ἔργου σκιή*. And, besides the number, even the quality of Democritus's witnesses is greater than the others' in a case of this nature. For Isidorus, a Christian writer, was not versed so well in heathen authors as Plutarch and Laërtius; and Psellus, I suppose, is too modern to be set in competition with them, being a thousand years younger than Plutarch, and nine hundred than Laërtius. In this part, therefore, Mr. B. has misrepresented me.

The other, as I said, is a mistake, where he says, *otherwise it would be of no use to me;* and, *if any of them have it except Democritus, Phalaris might have used it after them* (p. 139). What will not a man say, that can say such things, *with equal regard to truth and honour?* If we attribute it to Simonides, could Phalaris use it after him? though it be evident, beyond all question, that Simonides was a very child at the latest period of Phalaris's life![e] I had observed this in my *Dissertation;* Mr. B. has not one word in refutation of it, and yet could suffer these crude assertions to drop from his pen. Nay, further, if we allow Isidorus's account, and give the saying to the Lacedæmonians, yet it's very great odds that it's younger than Phalaris. For, if we examine the Laconic sentences collected by Plutarch, we shall find four parts of five there to be later than Phalaris's time.

But Mr. B. adds, that the words of Plutarch, *κατὰ Δημόκριτον*, do not imply, *That he thought Democritus to be the author of the saying, but only that he had met with it in Democritus's works* (p. 138). I am weary of dealing with

[d] Suid. in v. Πέντ.

[e] See here, p. 110, 111.

such poor objections, that have no sap nor spirit in them. In another place the same author says, that, *according to Simonides,*[f]

Ἄθηλος ἵππῳ πῶλος ὡς ἅμα τρέχειν·

And, *according to Plato,*[g] *Λόγου, κουφοτάτου πράγματος, βαρυτάτη ζημία.* Does not Plutarch here intimate that Simonides and Plato were the first authors of these sayings? There is nothing more common in him and others than *κατὰ τὸν Αἴσχυλον, κατὰ τὸν Εὐριπίδην, κατὰ τὸν Μένανδρον,* &c. Now, if we allow of Mr. B.'s exception, that these may not be the authors of the passages there attributed to them, but may have pillaged them from others, we shall have as many plagiaries as writers.

He insists further, *That Laërtius tells us, Solon used to say, Λόγον εἴδωλον εἶναι τῶν ἔργων; so that he does not make Democritus the author of the sentence we speak of* (p. 138). But, with the Examiner's leave, there is a difference between *Λόγος εἴδωλον τῶν ἔργων* and *Λόγος ἔργου σκιά*: and if Laërtius had not thought so, he would not have named them both. If the words in Phalaris's Epistle had been *Λόγος εἴδωλον τῶν ἔργων,* I had never made an objection from them against the *Epistles;* because Solon was as old as the true Phalaris. But since the words are *Λόγος ἔργου σκιά,* which, as Plutarch, Laërtius, and Suidas, assure us, was the peculiar phrase and turn that Democritus gave to that thought, 'tis an objection unanswerable.

But, by virtue of an *old saying,* as he calls it, *Nihil est dictum, quod non dictum prius* (p. 137), *he believes that Λόγος ἔργου σκιὰ might be lit upon a hundred times before Democritus made it famous* (p. 139). I perceive the gentleman understands not the *old saying* he speaks of. The first that used it was Terence, in the Prologue to *Eunuchus;* where he excuses himself for borrowing some characters from Menander, in these elegant verses:

[f] κατὰ τὸν Σιμωνίδην.

[g] κατὰ τὸν Πλάτωνα.

Quòd si personis iisdem uti aliis non licet;
Quí magis licet currentes servos scribere,
Bonas matronas facere, meretrices malas,
Parasitum edacem, gloriosum militem,
Puerum supponi, falli per servum senem,
Amare, odisse, suspicari? denique,
Nullum est JAM *dictum, quod non dictum sit priùs.*

His excuse is this, *That all characters were already exhausted by the numbers of poets that had gone before* (there being at that time above 2000 Greek comedies extant, besides the Latin ones); *so that nothing could* NOW *be said, that was not said already.* Now, he says, that is, *in his own time,* in the rear of so many poets: but it had been very absurd in Epicharmus's mouth, or any other of the first writers of comedy. And 'tis as absurd in our Examiner to infer from this *saying,* that a saying could not be first lit upon by Democritus, who comes so early in the chronology of learning. Surely, every saying had some beginning; unless Mr. B. will suppose that the world and human race have been eternally as they are now. But he himself affords a full refutation of his *Nihil est dictum;* for there are many such *nostrums* in his Book, such proper and peculiar mistakes, as were never thought on nor said by any man before him.

VIII.

In the LI. Epistle, to Eteonicus, there is another moral sentence; *Θνητοὺς γὰρ ὄντας ἀθάνατον ὀργὴν ἔχειν, ὡς φασί τινες, οὐ προσήκει, Mortal men ought not to entertain immortal anger.* But I am afraid he will have no better success with this than the former. For Aristotle, in his *Rhetoric,*[h] among some other sententious verses, cites this iambic as commonly known;

[h] Lib. ii. cap. 21.

Ἀθάνατον ὀργὴν μὴ φύλαττε, θνητὸς ὤν.

This, though the author of it be not named, was probably, like most of those proverbial *gnomæ*, borrowed from the stage; and consequently must be later than Phalaris, let it belong to what poet you please, tragic or comic.

But, because it may be suspected that the poet himself might take the thought from common usage, and only give it the turn and measure of a verse; let us see if we can discover some plainer footsteps of imitation, and detect the lurking Sophist under the mask of the Tyrant. Stobæus[1] gives us these verses out of Euripides's *Philoctetes:*

Ὥσπερ δὲ θνητὸν καὶ τὸ σῶμ' ἡμῶν ἔφυ,
Οὕτω προσήκει μηδὲ τὴν ὀργὴν ἔχειν
Ἀθάνατον, ὅστις σωφρονεῖν ἐπίσταται.

Now, to him that compares these with the words of the Epistle, 'twill be evident that the author had this very passage before his pen: there is ἔχειν and προσήκει; not only a sameness of sense, but even of words, and those not necessary to the sentence; which could not fall out by accident.* And where

[1] Tit. xx. περὶ Ὀργῆς. [I. 382. *ed. Gaisf.*—D.]

[* "Bentleius in immortali istâ de Phalaridis Epistolis Dissertatione hæc "verba Epist. LI. (XXIV. Lennep.), Θνητοὺς γὰρ ὄντας ἀθάνατον ὀργὴν ἔχειν, ὡς "φασί τινες, οὐ προσήκει, ex Euripide mutua sumta existimat, cui sanè hac-"tenùs assentior. Verùm, quod non vidit Vir summus, non sunt ista ex Euri-"pide imitando expressa, sed sunt ipsa Tragici verba, ita legenda: Θνητοὺς γὰρ "ὄντας ἀθάνατον ὀργὴν ἔχειν Οὕτοι προσήκει. Duo erant, quæ, ne viri docti hoc "perviderent, faciebant. Primum, quòd nesciebant ἀθάνατον primam produ-"cere, quod apud omnes antiquos et genuinos Græciæ poëtas semper fieri "præstabo, aliàs forsitan Brunckii et aliorum errores castigaturus. Deinde, "paullò minùs grati sunt numeri, quàm in plerisque Tragicorum senariis, non

has he now a friend at a pinch to support his sinking credit? for Euripides was not born in Phalaris's time. Nay, to come nearer to our mark; from Aristophanes[j] the famous grammarian, (who, after Aristotle, Callimachus, and others, writ the Διδασκαλίαι, *A Catalogue and Chronology of all the Plays of the Poets;* a work, were it now extant, most useful to ancient history,) we know that this very fable, *Philoctetes,* was written Olymp. LXXXVII., which is CXX. years after the Tyrant's destruction.

I had said, that the iambic verse quoted by Aristotle,

Ἀθάνατον ὀργὴν μὴ φύλαττε, θνητὸς ὤν,

was probably borrowed from the stage. This does not please the Examiner; for he comes upon me with this gravelling question, *Why more* probably *borrowed from the stage than from Archilochus's iambics, the fragments of which are full of those proverbial sentences?* (p. 140.) I'll tell you, Sir, why more *probably* from the stage than from Archilochus. First, because in Aristotle's time there were a thousand iambics of the stage for one of Archilochus's. The plays of the old comedy were CCCLXV.;[k] of the middle comedy, DCXVII.; nay, Athenæus says,[l] that he himself had read above DCCC. plays of the middle comedy. Add to these all the tragedies, which in all probability were more than the others; and it will be reasonable to suppose, that there were as many whole plays in Aristotle's days, as there were single

" tamen omninò inusitati. Euripid. Hec. 1230. ἀχθεινὰ μέν μοι τἀλλότρια " κρίνειν κακά. Ion. 619. ἐλθὼν δ' ἐς οἶκον ἀλλότριον, ἔπηλυς ὤν. Bacch. 1064. " λαβὼν γὰρ ἐλάτης οὐράνιον ἄκρον κλάδον. Simile est, cùm tribrachys in quarto " loco vocem complet, eumque monosyllabon præcedit. Sophocl. Antig. 263. " κοὐδεὶς ἐναργής, ἀλλ' ἔφυγε τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι." &c. PORSON, *ad Eurip. Medeam,* 139, 140.—D.]

[j] Argument. Medeæ Eur. [k] Prolog. ad Arist.

[l] Athen. p. 366. [=III. 240. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

iambic verses in all Archilochus's poems. And, secondly, because Aristotle, in the very same place where he cites this sentence, brings several others; all of which, except one, we are sure are fetched from the stage, out of Euripides and Epicharmus; and even that one is very likely to be taken from the same place. And now I would beg leave, in my turn, to ask the Examiner a question: What he means when he says, *The fragments of Archilochus's iambics are full of those proverbial sentences?* For I believe there are not ten iambics of Archilochus's now extant, and but two of them are proverbial sentences. He tells me in another place, *That collecting Greek fragments is a fit employment for me, and I have succeeded well in it* (p. 285). But when he pleases to produce those iambics of Archilochus's, *full* of such sententious sayings, I'll acknowledge his talent at that employment to be better than mine.

My inference was, that if this iambic came from the stage, *it must be later than Phalaris, let it belong to what poet soever, tragic or comic.* This consequence, says Mr. B., *I can never allow; because I am very well satisfied that there were both tragic and comic poets before the days of Phalaris* (p. 140). The age of *tragedy* he reserves for another section; but for *comedy* he produces Susarion, who is said to have invented it before the tyranny of Pisistratus.

'Tis the Examiner's good fortune to be never more in the wrong than when he talks most superciliously and with the greatest assurance. He can *never allow* my inference; and he is *very well satisfied.* But I must tell him, to his further *satisfaction,* that though we suppose plays were acted a little before or in Phalaris's time, yet it does not presently follow, as a consequence, that Phalaris could cite that verse out of a poet, whether tragic or comic.

First, because it is an *iambic verse;* and it was a good while after the invention of comedy and tragedy, before that measure was used in them. Aristotle assures us of this, as far as it concerns tragedy; *The measure,* says he, *in tragedy was changed from* tetrameters *to* iambics. *For at first they*

used tetrameters, *because the* trochaïc *foot is more proper for dancing.*[m] And the same reason will hold for comedy too; because that, as well as tragedy, was at first *nothing but a song performed by a chorus dancing to a pipe.*[n] It stands to reason, therefore, that there also the *tetrameter* was used, rather than the *iambic*, which, as the same Aristotle observes,[o] was fit for *business* rather than dancing, and for *discourse* rather than singing.

And secondly, because both comedy and tragedy, in their first beginnings at Athens, were nothing but *extemporal* diversions, not just and regular poems; they were neither published, nor preserved, nor written, but, like the entertainments of our merry-andrews on the stages of mountebanks, were bestowed only upon the present assembly, and so forgotten. Aristotle declares this expressly; *Both tragedy and comedy*, says he, *were at first made* EX TEMPORE:[p] and another very good writer, Maximus Tyrius, tells us, *That the ancient plays at Athens were nothing but choruses of boys and men; the husbandmen in their several parishes, after the labours of seed-time and harvest, singing* EXTEMPORAL *songs.*[q] Donatus, or whoever is the author of that discourse about comedy, says, *Thespis was the first that* writ *his plays, and by that means made them public.*[r] But he was younger than the Tyrant's time, as it will appear more manifestly anon. So that Phalaris, as I conceive, could not meet with this verse in those days, when the plays were not *written;* unless Mr. B. will bring him over the sea *incognito* to the merriments in the Attic villages.

[m] Poët. c. iv. [=x. *ed. Tyrw.*—D.] Τὸ μὲν πρῶτον τετραμέτρῳ ἐχρῶντο. So also in Rhet. iii. 1.

[n] Donatus. Comœdia ferè vetus, ut ipsa quoque olim tragœdia, simplex carmen .... fuit, quod chorus .... cum tibicine concinebat. [*Evanth. De Tr. et Com.—Terent. ed. Wester.* I. lv.—D.]

[o] Poët. c. xxiv. and iv. [=xli. and x. *ed. Tyrw.*—D.]

[p] Poët. c. iv. [=ix. *ed. Tyrw.*—D.] Γενομένη οὖν ἀφ' ἀρχῆς ΑΥΤΟΣΧΕΔΙΑΣΤΙΚΗ, καὶ αὐτὴ καὶ ἡ κωμῳδία.

[q] Dissert. xxi. [=xxxvii. *ed.* 1740.—D.] ᾄσματα ᾄδοντες ΑΥΤΟΣΧΕΔΙΑ.

[r] Thespis autem primus hæc scripta in omnium notitiam protulit.

And this, perhaps, may be the true reason why the most of those that have spoken of the origin of comedy make no mention of Susarion or his contemporaries, but ascribe the invention of it to Epicharmus. For, as it seems, nothing of that kind was *written* and transmitted to posterity before the time of that Sicilian. Theocritus, therefore, is express and positive, *that Epicharmus* INVENTED *comedy:*

> Ἅ τε φωνὰ Δώριος· χὠ ἀνὴρ, ὁ τὰν κωμῳδίαν
> Εὑρὼν, Ἐπίχαρμος.[s]

Comedy, says Themistius, BEGAN *of old in Sicily; for Epicharmus and Phormus were of that country.*[t] *Epicharmus*, says Suidas, *together with Phormus*, INVENTED *comedy at Syracuse.*[u] And Solinus, in his description of Sicily; *Here*, says he, *was comedy* FIRST INVENTED.[v] *Some are of opinion*, says Diomedes, *that Epicharmus* FIRST *made comedy.*[w] Aristotle makes some small intimation of Susarion's pretences, but he expresses himself so, that he does as good as declare in favour of Epicharmus. I'll give the reader his own words: *The pretenders*, says he, *to the invention of comedy are the Megarenses, both those here* (he means the Megarenses near Attica) *and those in Sicily; for Epicharmus was of that place, who is much older than Chionides and Magnes.*[x] When he says, *the Megarenses that are here*, he may hint perhaps at Susarion, who was born at that Megara; but he plainly signifies that his claim was of no great weight, by passing him over without a name. He might allow him to be the author of some *extempore* farces, that may be called the first rudiments of comedy; and that's all that with justice can be granted him. And with this opinion all those fall in who assert that comedy is more recent than tragedy; for the same persons suppose Thespis to be the inventor of tragedy, who lived about Olymp. LXI. Horace, after he had given an

[s] Theoc. Epig. 17. [t] Them. Orat. xix. [u] Suid. Ἐπιχ.
[v] Solin. Hic primùm inventa comœdia. [w] Diom. p. 486.
[x] Arist. Poët. c. 3.

account of the rise of tragedy and satyr;* AFTER *these*, says he, *came the old comedy; Successit vetus his comœdia.*[y] *His*, says the ancient Scholiast, *scil. satyræ et tragœdiæ.*† And Donatus is very positive, *That tragedy is senior to comedy, both in the subject of it and the time of its invention.*[z]

Well, then, if Epicharmus was the first writer of comedy, it will soon appear that the true Phalaris could not borrow an iambic from the stage. For it's well known that Epicharmus lived with Hiero of Syracuse;[a] and the author of the *Arundel Marble* places them both at Olymp. LXXVII. 1., when Chares was Archon at Athens; which is LXXVIII. years after Phalaris's death. 'Tis true Epicharmus lived to a very great age; to XC. years, as Laërtius says;[b] or to XCVII., as Lucian.[c] Now, allow the greater of these numbers for the true term of his life; and suppose, too, that he died that very year when he is mentioned in the Marble (though it cannot fairly be presumed so); yet he would but be XVIII. years old in the last year of Phalaris's reign; which perhaps will be thought too young an age to set up for an inventor; for all great wits are not so very early and forward as *a young writer* (Præf. p. 3.) that I have heard of.

Or, again; if Phormus, who is joined with Epicharmus, be supposed the first poet of the stage, the matter will not be at all mended; for even he, too, is too young to do the *Epistles* any service. His name is written different ways: Athenæus and Suidas call him *Phormus*;[d] but Aristotle, *Phormis*.[e] In Themistius 'tis written *Amorphus*;[f] which is an evident depravation. Some learned men would write it *Phormus* too in Aristotle; but if that be true which Suidas relates of him, that he was *an acquaintance of Gelo the Syracusian's, and tutor to his children*,[g] the true reading must be

[* *i. e.* the satyric drama.—D.]

[† In the old ed. "Satyris *et Tragœdiæ:*" but see *Hor. ed. Cruq.* 1611. p. 632.—D.]

[y] Art. Poët. v. 281.

[a] De Com.

[b] Laërt. Epich.

[c] Φόρμις. Poët. c. v.

[z] Plut. Schol. Pind. &c.

[c] Luc. in Macrob.

[f] Ἄμορφος.

[d] Φόρμος.

[g] Suid. in Φορμ.

Phormis. For he is the same Phormis that, as Pausanias tells at large,[h] came to great honour in the service of Gelo, and of Hiero after him: and that, I think, is a proof sufficient that he did not invent comedy as early as the time of Phalaris.

Upon the whole matter, I suppose, from what has been said, these four things will be allowed; That the authorities for Epicharmus are more and greater than those for Susarion: that if Epicharmus was the first comedian, Phalaris could not cite a passage out of comedy: that allowing Susarion to have contributed something towards the invention of comedy, yet his plays were extemporal, and never published in writing, and consequently unknown to Phalaris: and lastly, that, if they were published, 'tis more likely they were in *tetrameters* and other chorical measures, fit for dances and songs, than in iambics. So far is it from being a just consequence, *If comedy was but heard of at Athens, Phalaris might quote iambics out of it;* though it gave such *great satisfaction* to the learned Examiner.

'Tis true, there are five iambics extant that are fathered upon Susarion, and perhaps may really be his:

> Ἀκούετε, λεὼς· Σουσαρίων λέγει τάδε,
> Τὶὸς Φιλίνου, Μεγαρόθεν, Τριποδίσκιος·
> Κακὸν, γυναῖκες· ἀλλ' ὅμως, ὦ δημόται,
> Οὐκ ἐστὶν οἰκεῖν οἰκίαν ἄνευ κακοῦ.
> Καὶ γὰρ τὸ γῆμαι, καὶ τὸ μὴ γῆμαι, κακόν.

The first four of these are produced by Diomedes Scholasticus in his *Commentary on Dionysius Thrax,** a MS. now in the Royal Library; the last, with three others, by Stobæus;[i] the first, third, and fourth, by Diomedes the Latin grammarian;[j] and the third and fourth by Suidas.[k] The emen-

[h] Eliac. i.

[* Published in vol. ii. of Bekker's *Anecd. Gr.;* where (p. 748) is Σουδαρίων instead of Σουσαρίων.—D.]

[i] Stob. tit. lxvii. [= III. 30. *ed. Gaisf.*—D.]

[j] Lib. iii. p. 486. [*ed. Putch.*—D.]

[k] Suid. v. οὔτε σύν. [= II. 2756. *ed. Gaisf.*—D.]

dation of the second verse is owing to the excellent Bishop Pearson;[1] for it's very faulty in the MS. But the first verse, as he has published it,

Ἀκούετε λέξεως, Σουσαρίων τάδε λέγει,

has two errors in it against the measures of iambics. So that, to heal that flaw in the verse, for λέξεως it's written λέξιν in the Latin Diomedes. But the true reading is Ἀκούετε, λεὼς, as it's extant in Stobæus; that is, *Hear, O people!* 'Tis the form that criers used; and means the same thing with our *O yes!*[m] Plutarch tells us, *That in the parish of the Pallenians of Attica 'twas unlawful for the crier to use that common form,* Ἀκούετε, λεὼς, *because a certain crier, called* Leos, *had formerly betrayed their ancestors.*[n] Stratonicus the musician made a quibble about it; for, as he once was in Mylasa,* a city that had few inhabitants, but a great many temples, he comes into the market-place, as if he would proclaim something; but, instead of Ἀκούετε, λαοὶ, as the form used to be, he said Ἀκούετε, ναοί.[o] In Lucian's *Sale of Philosophers,* the form that Mercury the crier uses is Ἄκουε, σίγα. And so much by way of digression, to supply the emendation of the incomparable Pearson.

If I would imitate somebody's artifice, in suppressing and smothering what he thinks makes against him, I might easily conceal a passage of this yet unpublished MS., which carries in it a specious objection against something I have said. Diomedes introduces those verses of Susarion with these words: *One Susarion,* says he, *was the beginner of comedy in verse; whose plays were all lost in oblivion, but*

[1] Vind. Ignat. ii. 11.

[m] Or *oyez.* The Attic idiom has it Ἀκούετε, λεώ. Aristoph. (Acharn. p. 300.) [=v. 964. *ed. Bekk.*, where . . . . τοὺς χόας.—D.]

Ἀκούετε, λεώ· κατὰ τὰ πάτρια τὰς χοὰς, &c.

And again (Iren. p. 454.) [=v. 543. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

Ἀκούετε, λεώ· τοὺς γεωργοὺς ἀπίεναι, &c. [*Adden.*]

[n] Plut. in Thes. [* Mylassa; Gr. Μύλασσα.—D.]

[o] Athen. p. 348. [=III. 284. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

there are two or three iambics of a PLAY *of his still remembered.*[p] Here's an express testimony that Susarion used iambics in his plays; though I have newly endeavoured to make it probable that, in the first infancy of comedy, the iambic was not used there; as we are certain, from Aristotle, that it was not in tragedy. But I have one or two exceptions against Diomedes's evidence. First, he stands alone in it; he is a man of no great esteem; he lived many hundreds of years after the thing that he speaks of; so that it ought to pass for no more than a conjecture of his own. And again, I would have it observed, that these five iambics are spoken in the person of Susarion; which will go a great way towards a proof that they are no part of a *play*. For, when the poet in his own name would speak to the spectators, he makes use of the *chorus* to that purpose; and it is called a παράβασις,[q] of which sort there are several now extant in Aristophanes. But the measures that the chorus uses at that time are never iambics, but always anapæsts or tetrameters. And I believe there is not one instance that the chorus speaks at all to the pit in iambics; to the actor it sometimes does. And lastly, if these verses of Susarion's had been known to be borrowed from a *play*, it could not have been such a secret to Aristotle. For it's plain, I think, that he had met with no certain tradition of any play of Susarion's: if he had, he would never attribute the invention of comedy to the Sicilians, so long after him. This argument will not seem inconsiderable, if we remember what an universal scholar that philosopher was, and that he had particularly applied himself to know the history of the stage, having writ a treatise of the *Διδασκαλίαι, An Account of the Names, and the Times, and the Authors of all the Plays that ever were acted.* If the verses, therefore, are truly Susarion's, 'tis

[p] Πρῶτον μὲν οὖν Σουσαρίων τις τῆς ἐμμέτρου κωμῳδίας ἀρχηγὸς ἐγένετο, οὗ τὰ μὲν δράματα λήθῃ κατενεμήθησαν· δύο δὲ ἢ τρεῖς ἴαμβοι τοῦ δράματος ἐπὶ μνήμῃ φέρονται. [In Bekker's *Anecd. Gr.* ii. 748. Πρῶτον οὖν Σουδαρίων . . . . κατενεμήθη . . . . and τοῦ πρώτου δράματος.—D.]

[q] Schol. Aristoph. Hephæst. Pollux.

probable they were made upon some other occasion, and not for the stage.

To return now to our Examiner; let us see a little how he manages his Susarion; for it's a wonder, if, besides a general fault in producing a weak argument, he do not add several incidental ones, which a more skilful manager might have avoided. And, to justify my suspicion of him, his very first sentence has two or three errors in it. *The* Chronicon Marmoreum, says he, *informs us, that comedy was brought* INTO ATHENS *by Susarion, or rather, that a* STAGE *was by him first erected in Athens* (p. 140). And from the word STAGE he would draw an inference, *That Susarion was not the inventor, but an improver only, of comedy* (p. 141). Now, I affirm that the *Marble Chronicon* says nothing here about ATHENS or a STAGE. I will set down the whole paragraph, as it was published from the original by Mr. Selden and Mr. Young:

*'Αφ' οὗ ἐν 'Αθ . . . αις κωμω . . . ρ . . . εθη . . . σανι . . . των 'Ικαριέων ἡυρόντος Σουσαρίωνος καὶ δολον . . τεθ . . . ππω τον ισχα . . δ . . αρσιχο . . . νοινου . . . ερ . . ος . . .**

In this worn and broken condition the passage was printed by Mr. Selden; and the supplements that have been made to it since are only learned men's conjectures, and may lawfully be laid aside if we have better to put in their places. The first word[s] of it, *ἐν ἀθ . . . αις*, Mr. Selden guessed to be *ἐν 'Αθήναις, in Athens;* wherein he is followed by Palmerius, Pearson, Marsham, and every body since. But, with humble submission to those great names, I am persuaded it should not be so corrected. For the author of the Marble, when he would say *in Athens*, always uses *'Αθήνησιν*, and never *ἐν 'Αθήναις*.† So, in line the 5th, *'Αφ' οὗ*

[* So the passage stands, "charactere communi," in *Marm. Arund.* p. 10. *ed.* 1628. See it also in its original orthography, p. 3. ibid.—D.]

[† "*ἐν* 'Αθήνησ', Homer. Il. B. 549. *ἐν ταῖς* 'Αθήναις, Eur. Phœn. 1719. *ἐν* "'Αθήναις, Thucyd. v. 18. ibid. 23. *ἐν* 'Αθήνησι, see p. 372, 3." (*i. e.* the commencement of the viiith section of that portion of the present work which treats of the Attic Dialect.) DOBREE, *Advers.* ii. 366.—D.]

δίκη Ἀθήνησι, and 33, ἀφ' οὗ Ἀθήνησι, and 61, . . ἐν Ἀθήνησι, and 70, ἐνίκησεν Ἀθήνησι διδάσκων, so in 79, 81, 83, 85; besides what comes almost in every epoch of it, ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησιν. 'Tis not credible, therefore, that in this single passage he should say ἐν Ἀθήναις. Besides, that it is not true in fact that Susarion found comedy at Athens; for it was at Icarius, a country parish in Attica, as Athenæus informs us:[r] which is the reason that Clem. Alex. calls Susarion an Icarian.[s] And the Marble itself, in this very place, names the Icarians τῶν Ἰκαριέων. But surely the same person could not act *first* both at Icarius and Athens, in country and city at once. 'Tis observable, therefore, that in another epoch, where the Marble says, *that tragedy was first acted by Thespis*, who was an Icarian too,[t] there's nothing said of Athens. Our Examiner, therefore, is quite out when he quotes it as the words of the Marble, *that Susarion brought comedy into* ATHENS.

His next mistake is, when he tells us, as out of the Marble, *that Susarion set up his* STAGE *at Athens* (p. 140, 141). The whole foundation of this imaginary *stage* is that fragment of a word . . . . σανι . . . . which the very ingenious and learned Palmerius fancied ought to be ἐπὶ σανίσι, *acted upon boards*;[u] and his conjecture is approved by the great Pearson.[v] This, in the edition of the *Marmora Oxoniensia*, was, I know not why, changed into ἐν σανίσι, *in boards*. And the Examiner, who, without question, understands how comedies may be put *into boards*, (though the groaning board of famous memory might rather belong to some tragedy,) judiciously follows this casual oversight in that elegant edition.[w]

I desired my worthy friend Dr. Mill to examine with his own eyes this passage in the Marble, which is now at Oxford, and makes part of the glory of that noble Univer-

[r] P. 40. [= I. 152. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

[s] Σουσαρίων Ἰκαριεύς. Strom. i.

[t] Suid. Θεσ.

[u] Exercit. p. 702.

[v] Vind. Ignat. ii. 11.

[w] See the notes there, p. 203, 204.

sity. And he informs me, that those letters which Mr. Selden and Mr. Young took to be *ΣΑΝΙ* are now wholly invisible, not the least footstep being left of them: and as for *ΕΝΑΘ* .. the two last letters are so defaced, that one cannot be certain they were *ΑΘ*, but only something like 'em. I am of opinion, therefore, that the entire writing in the Marble was, not *ἐν Ἀθήναις*, but *ἐν ἀπήναις, in plaustris;* and that *ΣΑΝΙ* has no relation to *σανίδες, boards,* but is the last syllable of a verb. So that I would fill up the whole passage thus: *ΑΦ Ου ΕΝ ΑΠηνΑΙΣ ΚΩΜΩδιαι εφορ-ΕΘΗΣΑΝ Υπο ΤΩΝ ΙΚΑΡΙΕΩΝ ΗΥΡΟΝΤΟΣ ΣΟΥΣΑ-ΡΙΩΝΟΣ*; that is, *Since comedies were carried in carts by the Icarians, Susarion being the inventor.* That in the beginning the plays were *carried* about the villages *in carts,* we have a witness beyond exception:

> *Ignotum tragicæ genus invenisse camenæ*
> *Dicitur, et* PLAUSTRIS VEXISSE *poëmata Thespis.*[x]

And so the old Scholiast upon the place; *Thespis primus tragœdias invenit; ad quas recitandas circa vicos* PLAUSTRO *quoque vehebatur ante inventionem scenæ.* And I suppose it's sufficiently known that *ἀπήνη* is the same with PLAUSTRUM. Hesychius and Suidas; *Ἀπήνη, ἅμαξα.* Eustathius twice; *Ἅμαξαν μὲν καὶ ἀπήνην εἰπεῖν ταυτὸν ἐστίν. Glossarium Philoxeni; Plaustrum, ἅμαξα; plostrum, ἅμαξα.**

If this conjecture of mine may seem probable, the next, I dare pass my word, will amount even to certainty. The words in the Marble, as Mr. Selden published them, are these; *Και δολον . . . . τεθ . . . . ππωτονισχα . . . . δ . . . . αρσιχο . . . . νοινου . . . ερ . . . . ος. . . . .* Out of which broken pieces the ingenious Palmerius[y] endeavoured to make this sentence; *Καὶ Δόλωνος τεθρίππῳ, τὸν ἰσχάδων ἄρσιχον,*

[x] Horat. in Art. Poët. [275.—D.]

[* Lennep, in his Latin version of Bentley's *Diss.* (p. 264. *ed.* 1781.), has "*Plostrum, ἀπήνη;*" but, according to the eds. both of Vulcanius and Labbe, the *Gloss. Philox.* is rightly quoted in our text.—D.]

[y] Palmer. ibid.

πίθον οἴνου; that is, *Dolon* (together with Susarion) *was inventor of comedy; the prize of which was a basket of figs and a hogshead of wine, which were carried home by the victor in a chariot with four horses.* But he ingenuously confesses, that he never read any thing of this Dolon, a comic poet, nor of such prizes as a basket of figs and a hogshead of wine; nor that they were conveyed home in a chariot. However, this emendation of his is approved and followed by the learned publisher of *Marmora Oxoniensia.*

I was led, by the very sense of the place, to suspect that Mr. Selden or Mr. Young had copied the inscription wrong; and that instead of *ΔΟΛΟΝ . . ΤΕΘ . . ΠΠΩΤΟΝ*, they ought to have read it *ΑΘΛΟΝ ΕΤΕΘΗ ΠΡΩΤΟΝ*; for the difference in these letters is very small, and such as might escape even a curious eye in so dim an inscription. I communicated by letter this suspicion of mine to the Reverend Dr. Mill, who will bear me witness that I sent this correction to him before he had looked upon the stone; and I asked the favour of him, that he would consult the Marble itself; and he returned me this answer, That the writing in the Marble is fair and legible enough in this very manner, *ΚΑΙ ΑΘΛΟΝ ΕΤΕΘΗ ΠΡΩΤΟΝ ΙΣΧΑΔΩ . . ΑΡΣΙΧΟ . . ΚΑΙ ΟΙΝΟΥ.* I conceive, therefore, this whole passage should thus be restored; *Καὶ ἆθλον ἐτέθη πρῶτον, ἰσχάδων ἄρσιχος, καὶ οἴνου ἀμφορεύς*; that is, *And the prize was first proposed, a basket of figs and a small vessel of wine.* Dolon, we see, and his *coach and four*, are vanished already: and as for the prizes for the victory, which Palmerius owns he knew nothing of, I think I can fairly account for them out of a passage in Plutarch:[z] *Anciently*, says he, *the feast of Bacchus was transacted country-like and merrily: first there was carried* (ἀμφορεὺς οἴνου) A VESSEL OF WINE *and a branch of a vine; then followed one that led* A GOAT (τράγον) *after him; another carried* (ἰσχάδων ἄῤῥιχον) A BASKET OF

[z] Plut. περὶ φιλοπλουτ.

FIGS; *and last of all came the phallus* (ὁ φάλλος). Now, as both tragedy and comedy had their first rise from this feast of Bacchus, the one being invented by those that sung the *dithyramb*,[a] and the latter by those that sung the *phallic*; so, the prizes and rewards for those that performed best were ready upon the spot, and made part of the procession; *the vessel of wine and the basket of figs* were the *premium* for comedy, and *the goat* for tragedy. Both the one and the other are expressed in these verses of Dioscorides's, never yet published, which shall further be considered in the XI. section, *about the age of tragedy:*

Βάκχος ὅτε τριττὸν κατάγοι χορὸν, ᾧ ΤΡΑΓΟΣ ἆθλον,
Χ' ὡ'ττικὸς ἦν ΣΥΚΩΝ ΑΡΡΙΧΟΣ ὕθλος ἔτι.

Now, I would ask the Examiner one question, If he can really think Susarion made regular and finished comedies, with the solemnity of a *stage*, when the prize, we see, that he contended for, was the cheap purchase of a cask of wine and a parcel of dried figs? These sorry prizes were laid aside when comedy grew up to maturity; and to carry the day from the rival poets was an honour not much inferior to a victory at Olympia.

I'll forgive Mr. B. his double mistake of XXX. years, when he says, *Susarion must fall in between the* 610*th and the* 589*th** *year before Christ* (p. 141). For I find some other person has already reprehended him for't. And I am well pleased with his judgment of Bishop Pearson's performance,[b] *that he has proved*, BEYOND ALL CONTROVERSY, that *Susarion is a distinct poet from Sannyrion* (p. 141). I see the gentleman, if he be free and disinterested, can pass a true censure. Casaubon and Selden, as famous men in their generations as Mr. B. is in this,

[a] Arist. Poët. c. iv. [=ix. *ed. Tyrw.*—D.]

[* In both eds. of Boyle's work "489th"—a mistake of the printer, as is observed in *A View of the Dissert. &c.* 1698. p. 61. by Milner, who is the "some other person" mentioned above.—D.]

[b] Vind. Ignat. ii. 11.

thought both those names belonged to the same person; but Bishop Pearson, by one single chronological argument, has refuted them, says Mr. B., *beyond all controversy*. I may say, without breach of modesty, I have refuted Phalaris's *Epistles* by a dozen chronological proofs, each of them as certain as that one of the Bishop's, besides my arguments from other topics; and yet (to see what it is to be out of favour with Mr. B.) *I have proved nothing at all*. Mr. B., no doubt, has good motives for his giving such different characters; but I would ask him why he says, *Mr. Selden's opinion would bring Susarion down to Aristophanes's time?* (p. 141.) It would just do the contrary, and carry Sannyrion *up* above Pisistratus's time. For the epoch in the Marble was not doubted by Mr. Selden.

The Bishop, says Mr. B., *has proved that Sannyrion must live in Aristophanes's time*. This is true; but it still leaves his age undetermined within the wideness of xxxx. years, for so long Aristophanes was an author. If Mr. B. had been cut out for improving any thing, he might easily have brought Sannyrion's time to a narrower compass. For Sannyrion, in his play called *Danaë*, burlesqued a verse of Euripides's *Orestes*.[c] But *Orestes* was acted at Olymp. xcii. 4., when Diocles was Archon at Athens.[d] *Danaë*, therefore, must have come soon after it, or else the jest would have been too cold. The *Frogs* of Aristophanes, where the same verse is ridiculed, were acted the third year after, Olymp. xciii. 3.[e] So that we may fairly place the date of Sannyrion's *Danaë* between Olymp. xcii. 4. and Ol. xcv.

We are come now to the second part of my argument from this passage in Phalaris's Epistle; *Θνητοὺς γὰρ ὄντας ἀθάνατον ὀργὴν ἔχειν, ὡς φασί τινες, οὐ προσήκει*, *Mortal men, as some say, ought not to bear immortal anger*. The

[c] Schol. ad Ranas Aristoph. p. 142. [*Schol. to ed. Bekk.* p. 374.—D.] Schol. Orest. v. 279.

[d] Id. v. 371, 770.

[e] Argum. Ranar.

thought, as I observed, was to be met with in two several places; in a poet cited by Aristotle, and in Euripides's *Philoctetes*. Allow then, *first*, that the writer of the Epistle borrowed it from the former of these; then, as I have hitherto endeavoured to prove, and as I think with success, he could not be as ancient as the true Phalaris of Sicily. But the reader, I hope, will take notice, that all this was *ex abundanti;* for there are plain and visible footsteps that he has stole it, not from Aristotle's poet, but out of *Philoctetes*, which was not made till sixscore years after Phalaris's death. So that, let the dispute about comedy and Susarion fall as it will (though I think that to be no hazard), yet he will still be convicted of a cheat upon this second indictment.

The words of the pretended Phalaris are, *Θνητοὺς ὄντας ἀθάνατον ὀργὴν ἔχειν οὐ προσήκει.* The words of Euripides are,

> *Ὥσπερ δὲ θνητὸν καὶ τὸ σῶμ' ἡμῶν ἔφυ,*
> *Οὕτω προσήκει μηδὲ τὴν ὀργὴν ἔχειν*
> *Ἀθάνατον——*

In the comparing of which I remarked, that, besides the words *θνητὸς* and *ἀθάνατος ὀργὴ*, there are other words also that are found in both passages, *ὀργὴν ἔχειν* and *προσήκει*. As for *θνητὸς* and *ἀθάνατος ὀργὴ*, they are necessary to this sentence, and the thought cannot be expressed without them; for one cannot express this opposition of mortal and immortal, upon which the whole thought turns, in other Greek words than *θνητὸς* and *ἀθάνατος*. It might be said, therefore, in Phalaris's behalf, That, if two or more persons should hit upon this thought (which is far from impossible), there is no avoiding but they must needs fall into the very same expressions of *θνητὸς* and *ἀθάνατος ὀργὴ*; and yet none of them might steal them from any of the rest; as we see all the three words are found in that other verse quoted by Aristotle,

> *Ἀθάνατον ὀργὴν μὴ φύλαττε, θνητὸς ὤν.*

To occur, then, to this plausible pretence; I observed, there were other words in both passages alike, ὀργὴν ἔχειν and προσήκει; and that here there was no room for this specious objection. For ἔχειν and προσήκει are not necessary to the thought, as θνητὸς and ἀθάνατος are, because there are several other words that signify the same things; so that the sentence, as to this part of it, might be varied several ways; as one may say ὀργὴν φυλάττειν, as well as ἔχειν (and so the poet in Aristotle has it), or ὀργὴν τηρεῖν, or ὀργὴν τρέφειν, &c. And so, instead of προσήκει, one may say οὐ δεῖ, οὐ πρέπει, οὐ πρέπον ἐστὶν, οὐ προσῆκόν ἐστιν, or οὐ τηρητέον, οὐ φυλακτέον, and many other ways, which, by being intermixed, would produce a great number of changes. So that, upon the whole, since the writer of the Epistle has the very numerical words of Euripides, in a case where it's so much odds that he would not have lit upon them by chance, I looked upon it, as I still do, to be a plain instance of imitation, and, consequently, a plain proof of an imposture.

Well, what says our severe Examiner to this? Why, truly, with a pretended jest, but at the bottom in sober earnest, *he lets Phalaris shift for himself, and is resolved not to answer this argument* (p. 143). I will not say how ungenerous a design this is, to leave his *Sicilian prince* in the lurch. But, I fear, it's too late now to shake him off with honour; his Phalaris will stick close to him longer than he will wish him. However, instead of an answer to me, he desires me to answer him, *Whether it was prudent in me to accuse Phalaris of a theft, by a pair of quotations pillaged from his poor Notes on this Epistle?* (p. 143.) Poor Notes! he may be *free with them*, because he claims them *as his own* (p. 35); and yet, as *poor* as he calls them, if common fame may be believed, somebody run in debt for them. But he *desires my answer;* and I will give it him, for the accusation is a very high one. To *pillage his poor Notes*, would be as barbarous as to rob the naked, and, I dare add, to as little purpose. My defence is, That these two passages which I have quoted are in Aristotle and Stobæus; and I

believe I may truly say, that I had read them in those two authors before Mr. B. knew the names of them. In other places he confesses, and makes it part of my character, *that I have applied myself with success to the collection of Greek fragments* (p. 285); why might I not have these two then out of the original authors? Are these sentences vanished out of Aristotle and Stobæus, since the memorable date of Mr. B.'s Edition of Phalaris? If ever they were used since, or shall be used hereafter, must they needs be *pillaged* from him? Alas! one may safely predict, without setting up for a prophet, that these sentences will still be quoted, when his *poor Notes*, and his poor *Examination* too, will have the happiness to be forgotten. If Mr. B. had made the same inference that I do from these sentences, there had been some colour for his accusation of theft; but he barely cites them in his Notes: and it's another great instance of the sagacity of our Examiner, that, when he even stumbled upon arguments, yet he could not *make use of them.*

I had taken notice, from the Scholiast on Euripides, *that* Philoctetes *was acted Ol.* LXXXVII. But an unknown author,[f] that has mixed himself in this controversy, has been pleased to object, *That some others say the* Phœnissæ *was acted then; so Scaliger's* Ὀλυμπιάδων ἀναγραφή, *and Aristophanes's Scholiast.* But here are several mistakes committed in this short objection. First, the author seems not to have known that there were four plays of Euripides's acted in one year: there's no consequence, therefore, in this argument; for *Phœnissæ* and *Philoctetes* might both of them be acted at Ol. LXXXVII. Then, both here and in other places, he argues from the Ὀλυμπιάδων ἀναγραφή, as if it was an ancient piece. But Scaliger himself confesses it's his own work; and in this passage that great man mistook himself, either by haste, or by trusting to his memory;* for,

[f] View of Dissert. p. 19. [by the Rev. John Milner, B.D., late vicar of Leeds in Yorkshire. *Note on ed.* 1777.]

[* "The inaccuracies [of Scaliger] may be partly ascribed to a want of "sufficient attention to the value of authorities. He often follows Diodorus or

instead of Φοίνισσαι, he designed to have writ Μήδεια, out of the Scholiast on Euripides; and such oversights are not unfrequent in that collection of his.[g] Again, the author is very much out in quoting the Scholiast on Aristophanes; which I suppose he might copy from the learned Mr. Barnes's *Life of Euripides*.[h] But, so far is that Scholiast from affirming that the *Phœnissæ* was acted Olymp. LXXXVII., that I will prove from him it was acted after Olymp. XCI. 2. For he twice declares[i] that the *Phœnissæ* was not then acted when Aristophanes brought his *Aves* upon the stage, which was at Olymp. XCI. 2.,[j] when Chabrias was Archon. And again,[k] he gives an account why Aristophanes, in his *Ranæ*, rather chose to ridicule the *Andromeda* of Euripides, which was *then* VIII. *years old, than* Hypsipyle, *or* PHŒNISSÆ, *or* Antiope, *all which had been acted a little while before*.[l] But the *Ranæ* was acted Olymp. XCIII. 3., when Callias was Archon.[m] It is plain, therefore, that the *Phœnissæ* must have been acted between Olymp. XCI. 2. and XCIII. 3. I dare so far rely upon this unknown author's candour, as to believe he will be satisfied with this reply. And I think there are no more of his animadversions that concern me or these *Dissertations*, that require a particular answer.

I have nothing more to say at present upon this article of comedy: but, that I may not break it off abruptly, without taking leave of the Examiner, I would desire one piece of justice at his hands; That, the next time he burlesques some *knotty* paragraph of mine, or any of his future antagonists',

" Eusebius, neglecting the surer testimonies of Xenophon or the orators. And " yet when we consider that he had no predecessor in such a work, and that the " plan and arrangement was original and his own, we shall give him due credit " for having performed so much." CLINTON's Intr. to *Fasti Hell., from* LV. *to* CXXIV. *Ol.*, p. XXVI.—D.]

[g] See here, p. 215. [h] Sect. XXVI.

[i] P. 382, 585. ed. Basil. [*Schol. to ed. Bekk.* p. 238, 240.—D.]

[j] Ibid. 366. [*Av. Argum.* I. 294. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

[k] Ibid. 132. [*Schol. to ed. Bekk.* p. 365.—D.]

[l] Πρὸ ὀλίγου διδαχθέντων.

[m] Ibid. p. 128. [*Ran. Argum.* I. 517. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

he would not add to it, of his own, four marks of parentheses ( ) ( ) like knots upon a string, to make it look the more *knottily* (p. 142). 'Twould be a very dear bargain to purchase a much better jest than that at the expense of truth and integrity.

IX.

The XII. Epistle exhibits Phalaris making this compliment to his friends; Ὧν εὐτυχούντων, κἂν αὐτὸς ἑτέρῳ συμπλακῶ δαίμονι, ἡσθεὶς οὐδὲν ἧττον εὐτυχεῖν δόξω, *That while they continued in prosperity, his joy for that, though himself should fall under misfortunes, would still make him happy.* But methinks those words, ἑτέρῳ δαίμονι, *the other god,* or *genius,* that is, the *bad* one, have a quaintness in them something poetical; and I am mistaken if they be not borrowed from some retainer to the Muses. And now I call it to mind, they are Pindar's,[n]

Δαίμων δ' ἕτερος
Ἐς κακὸν τρέψαις ἐδαμά | σατό νιν;

or Callimachus's, for this scazon of his is there cited by the Scholiast,

Οὐ πάντες, ἀλλ' οὓς ἔσχεν ἄτερος δαίμων.*

Whether of these our author made bold with, I cannot determine. Pindar, I should incline to guess, but that I find him familiar with Callimachus upon another occasion, Epist. CXXII., speaking of Perillus's invention of the Brazen Bull; Ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ τὸν ὄλεθρον

[n] Pyth. iii. [v. 62. *ed. Heyn.*—D.] [* *Fr. Call.* xci. p. 211. *ed. Blom.*—D.]

εὗρε κατὰ τῶν ἐπιβουλευόντων ἀχθηρότατον. Where he has taken that expression, τὸν ὄλεθρον εὗρε, from these verses of Callimachus,[o] that concern the same business,

Πρῶτος ἐπεὶ τὸν ταῦρον ἐκαίνισεν, ὃς τὸν ὄλεθρον
Εὗρε, τὸν ἐν χαλκῷ καὶ πυρὶ γινόμενον.

But, be it either of them as you will, I suppose the ages of both those poets are well enough known; so that, without any computation of years, one may pronounce these fine *Epistles* not to belong to Phalaris himself, but to his secretary the Sophist.

The Examiner, after a long prologue of *banter* and *grimace*, which he thinks he has a great talent at, comes at last to that little reasoning that he can spare upon this article. He will not allow ἕτερος δαίμων to be a poetical expression; *for which*, says he, *of the words is poetical*, ἕτερος *or* δαίμων? Ἕτερος *here signifies neither more nor less than* another; *and* δαίμων *is taken for* τύχη, fortune; *and so they are used in prose authors* (p. 144). Was there ever such an admirable touchstone found out, to try poetical expressions by? If the several words taken asunder have nothing poetical in them, then, to be sure, the whole can have nothing poetical. Will he please to lend it me a little, to make an essay upon a verse or two? as,

Luna, dies, et nox, et noctis signa severa.[p]

The men of letters have believed hitherto, that the latter part of this verse was in the poetical style, and that the prose of it was *sidera*. But, by the touchstone, I discover that *nox signifies neither more nor less than* night, and *signa*

[o] Schol. Pind. Pyth. i. [*Fr. Call.* cxix. p. 235. *ed. Blom.*—D.]
[p] Lucret. v. [1189.—D.]

nothing but signs, and *severa nothing but* severe; which are the common meanings of those words. There's nothing therefore of an *air of poetry* there, but it's all plain and vulgar language.

> *Cùm Proteus consueta petens è fluctibus antra*
> *Ibat; eum vasti circum gens humida ponti*
> *Exultans, rorem latè dispergit amarum.*[q]

I believe the author of these verses thought himself above the pitch of common prose, when he called the fish *humida gens ponti*, and the sea-water *rorem amarum:* but Mr. B. can prove he was mistaken; for he can shew him in Varro's prose, which was writ before the *Georgics*, *gens*, *a nation*, and *humida*, *moist*, and all the rest, if you take them single, in the very same sense that Virgil uses them. If the Examiner by this time be out of love with his touchstone, I will then make bold to tell him, That 'tis not the separate words ἕτερος, δαίμων, but the particular sense that is put upon them when they are joined together, that gives them a poetical air. That ἕτερος δαίμων, *the other genius*, should, without reference to the opposite one, signify absolutely *the evil genius*, is truly a *quaintness something poetical*. So the Scholiast on Pindar thought it, a writer of very good esteem, if we may put his judgment in the scale against Mr. B.'s; for he explains it, ἕτερος, ὁ κακοποιός; and adds the passage of Callimachus, to justify Pindar in the use of the phrase: which certainly he needed not have done, were it as familiar and prosaical as our censurer would make it.*

[q] Virgil. Georg. iv. [429.—D.]

[* "Sed hos versus (Rhesi) qui proximè præcedunt, partim cum Reiskio et "Heathio, sic opinor restituendos:

> Τίς ποτ' εὐτυχίας
> Ἐκ τῆς μεγάλης Τροίαν ἀνάγει
> Πάλιν εἰς πένθη
> Δαίμων ἕτερόν τι φυτεύων;

"Sic veteres ἕτερον et ἕτερόν τι per εὐφημισμὸν dicebant τὸ κακὸν. quique "*causa mali* Pythagoreis, Philolao, Timæo, Archytæ, ἀ κακοποιὸς ἀρχὰ, Plu-

His next exception, of the very same features and complexion with the former, is about ὄλεθρον εὗρε; which I had charged upon the Sophist as a phrase borrowed from Callimachus. *The Latin*, he says, *of this Greek*, invenere tormentum, *is in Horace; and he'll engage at a venture to find these two words together in a prose writer* (p. 145). Here's your man of resolution! *he'll engage at a venture;* and, indeed, his whole Book seems to be writ so. But I'll excuse him that trouble; and, since it will so much oblige him, I will shew him those two Greek words (which will serve his turn much better than his Latin ones) as close together as can be, in a verse of Hermesianax's,[r]

Εἰσόκε τοι δαίμων, Εὐριπίδη, ΕΤΡΕΝ ΟΛΕΘΡΟΝ,
Ἀμφὶ βίου στυγνῶν ἀντιάσαντι κυνῶν.

But I hope, in return, he'll be pleased to remember that I did not lay the stress of the argument upon this, that the two words ὄλεθρον εὗρε came *together* in Callimachus, but that they *concerned the same business;* for both the sophist and the poet were speaking of Perillus and his Bull. And if Mr. B., with his *index-hunting*, *will engage* to find the same words in another author, and upon the very same occasion, I'll *engage* too, without any *venture*, to shew that this other author too had been trading with Callimachus.

Mr. B. will not pass even the shortest section without giving us a cast of his learning, though it be quite besides the subject. *Callimachus*, he says, *Dorizes in saying* ἄτερος *for*

" tarcho ὁ τῶν φαύλων δημιουργὸς, dicebatur et ἕτερος δαίμων. Plutarch. de Is.
" et Os. ed. Squir. p. 116. οἱ δὲ τὸν μὲν ἀμείνονα, Θεὸν, τὸν δὲ ἕτερον, Δαίμονα
" καλοῦσιν, ὅσπερ Ζωροάστρης.—(Zoroastris de Deo magnifica dabit Euseb.
" Præp. Ev. I. p. 42. A.) hinc calamitates et infortunia ἕτερος δαίμων Phalaridi
" Epist. xii. Καλῶς et ἑτέρως opponuntur Demostheni de Cor. p. 150. § 150.
" Platonem in Theæteto scripsisse p. 173. D. εὖ δὲ ἢ ἑτέρως τι γέγονεν ἐν πόλει,
" suspicor ex Jamblichi Protr. c. xiv. p. 84, 25. Miror quæ scripsit Bentleius
" ad censuram Boylei." VALCKEN. *Diatr.* p. 112.—D.]

[r] Athen. p. 598. [=V. 165. *ed. Schw.*, who gives the passage thus,

Εἰσόκε τοι δαίμων Εὐριπίδη εὗρεν, κ.τ.λ.

—" Lege Εὐριπίδη in vocativo." Porson, in his *Tracts*, &c. (by Kidd), p. 245.—See also Hermann's *Opuscula*, iv. 248.—D.]

ἕτερος (p. 143). If the Examiner here had not catched at a jest, he might have saved a mistake in earnest. For, under favour, this ἄτερος is not the *Doric* idiom, but the *Ionic* and the *Attic*. Herodotus uses it, Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄτερος λόγος;[t] and Sophocles in his *Ajax*, Εἴθ' ἄτερος στρατηγός;* and some other writers in those dialects: but if Mr. B. has some second-hand writers which tell him 'tis *Doric* too, he will find them mistaken.

He concludes this article with telling the world, *that I have lately reprinted these two criticisms with my Fragments of Callimachus* (p. 145). And yet the world very well knows that those Fragments of Callimachus were printed a good while before the *Dissertation:* and I will tell him further, that the Fragments were *printed* before one single line of the *Dissertation* was *writ*. This it is to *engage at a venture:* but he ventures on still, and, *if he guesses right, 'tis the only part of the* Dissertation *that I ever will put into Latin.* Now, I seriously protest, that, out of kindness to him, besides other reasons, I have no design nor desire to have it in Latin; yet, when I consider what an awkward *guesser* he is, and perpetually in the wrong, 'tis a kind of a presage to me that he now *guesses* no better.

X.

The XXIII. Epistle is directed to Pythagoras; and there he gives to his doctrine and institution the name of *Philosophy;* Ἡ Φαλάριδος τυραννὶς τῆς Πυθαγόρου ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑΣ πλεῖστον ὅσον δοκεῖ κεχωρίσθαι.

[t] Herod. iv. 11.

[* "Hanc crasin R. B., formarum Atticarum perspicacissimum, effugisse, "mirum profectò. In Dissertatione de Phalaride . . . 'ἄτερος non est *Doricum*, "sed *Ionicum* et *Atticum*. Utuntur eo Herodotus, iv. 11. Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄτερος "λόγος,' (ἄλλος ex MSS. Arch. Pass. Ask. prætulit Wesselingius,) 'et in "Aj. (1109.) Sophocles, Εἴθ' ἄτερος στρατηγός.' Probâsset certè præstantissi-"mus vir, si marmor Sigeum paulò impensius explorâsset." KIDD, *note on Dawes's Miscel. Crit.*, p. 221. *ed.* 1827.—See also Meineke, Corrig. et Adden. to *Menand. et Phil. Rel.* p. 581.—D.]

And so again, in the LVI. he gives him the title of *Philosopher*, Πυθαγόρᾳ τῷ ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΩ. I could shew now, from a whole crowd of authors, that Pythagoras was the first man that invented that word; but I shall content myself with two, Diogenes Laërtius and Cicero. The former says,[u] Φιλοσοφίαν πρῶτος ὠνόμασε Πυθαγόρας, καὶ ἑαυτὸν Φιλόσοφον, ἐν Σικυῶνι διαλεγόμενος Λέοντι, τῷ Σικυωνίων τυράννῳ, ἢ Φλιασίων, *Pythagoras first named Philosophy, and called himself* Philosopher, *in conversation with Leon the Tyrant of Sicyon, or, as some say, of Phlius.* The latter tells us,[v] *That, when Pythagoras had discoursed before Leon; the Tyrant, much taken with his wit and eloquence, asked him what art or trade he professed. Art, says Pythagoras, I profess none; but I am a* PHILOSOPHER. *Leon, in admiration at the newness of the name, inquires what those philosophers were, and wherein they differed from other men.*[w] What a difference is here between the two Tyrants! The one knows not what *philosopher* means; the other seems to account it as threadbare a word as the name of *Wise* Men of Greece, and that too before ever he had spoken with Pythagoras. We cannot tell, at this distance of time, which conversation was first, that with Phalaris, or that with Leon. If Phalaris's was the first, the *Epistles* must be a cheat. But, allowing Leon's to be the first, yet it could not be long before the other. And 'tis very hard to believe that the fame of so small a business could so soon reach Phalaris's ear in his castle, through his guard of blue-

[u] P. 3. and 26. [v] Tuscul. Quæst. l. v.

[w] Quinam essent philosophi, et quid inter eos et reliquos interesset.

coats,* and the loud bellowings of his Bull. Nay, could we suppose him to have heard of it, yet surely, when he had written to Pythagoras, he would have ushered the word in with some kind of introduction, *that science which you call Philosophy;* and not speak of it as familiarly as if it had been the language of his nurse.

The sum of my argument from the word φιλόσοφος is this; That it was invented in Pythagoras's time, and by himself, and perhaps not till after his conversation with Phalaris; or if before, yet it's very improbable that Phalaris should have heard of the word before he had ever seen the man; nay, though he had heard of it, he would not have used it so vulgarly and familiarly, but have signified, by some short preamble, that the word was new, and Pythagoras's own.

Let us see, now, how the candid Mr. B. represents it. *He finds fault,* says he, *with Phalaris for calling Pythagoras Philosopher: why? because Pythagoras himself invented that word* (p. 160). Now, this is so far from being the whole argument, that it's no part of it at all. For, I do not blame his Phalaris for using the word φιλόσοφος *because Pythagoras invented it,* but *because he could not have then heard of it;* or, if he had, he should have *prefaced it with something, to signify its newness, and that Pythagoras was its author.* Is not this a most proper and honourable way of *giving the world an account of my performance?* (Pref.) But, however, he harangues upon this mock argument of his own; *Could Phalaris, therefore,* says he, *pay Pythagoras a greater compliment than by using the word? Queen Elizabeth first coined the word* fœminilis, *in a speech of hers to one of the Universities:*

[* This is not said at random; for I find the Agrigentines forbade their citizens to wear blue clothes, because blue was Phalaris's livery. So says Hadr. Junius *de Comâ,* cap. vi. SALTER. *Note on ed.* 1777.]

could that body have shewed her a handsomer piece of respect than by using that very word to her afterwards, as freely as if it had been one of the best age of Latin? All this, as I have plainly shewn, does not at all concern me or my argument; yet I mention it, that the reader may see what a rare judge of decency and good sense the Examiner is. For, I dare appeal to all persons truly of that character, if that wise princess would not have despised such a piece of mean pedantic flattery; and rather have commended the manly freedom of him that told a greater person than herself, upon his coining a barbarous word, *Hominibus, Cæsar, civitatem dare potes, verbis non potes: Your majesty may naturalise men, but you cannot naturalise words.* And what a clamour does Mr. B. make, because I first used, as he thinks, the word *commentitious!* (p. 287); yet, the same man here, in his great wisdom, would have a learned University make barbarisms a-purpose,* because a lady chances to do so. But 'tis to be hoped that reverend body is not under the same *direction* with Mr. B.

I had asked the question, *How came the fame of so small a business, as Pythagoras's discourse with Leon, to reach the ear of Phalaris,* who was so difficult of access, being intrenched commonly within his castle, and encompassed with his guard of executioners? The Examiner, who is puzzled at nothing, can very easily account for this: *for one may as well ask,* he says, *how he came to hear his name was Pythagoras? Fame, that told him the one, must tell him the other too* (p. 161). An extraordinary acuteness, indeed! If he hear of any man's name, he can give an account, with the

[* Bp. Lowth, Introduct. to English Grammar, art. PREPOSITION, cites this passage in confirmation of his own opinion, that the particle *a* before participles and nouns, in the phrases *a*-coming, *a*-bed, &c. (which Dr. Wallis supposed to be the preposition *at*), is the preposition *on*, a little disguised by familiar use and quick pronunciation. In the above phrase, Dr. Bentley plainly supposed *a* to be the same with *on*; and thus J. Hopkins, Ps. lxxxvii. 16. "The depths *on* trembling fell;" or, as we now say in common discourse, "they fell *a*-trembling." *Note on ed.* 1777.]

same facility, of all his conversation. A man that had got this admirable faculty would have had mighty preferment in Phalaris's court. A certain gossip of old, as the story goes, would needs tell her comrades what Jupiter once whispered to Juno in her ear. The company was inquisitive how she could know it then: but Mr. B. would have answered for her, *That they might as well ask her how she came to know his name was Jupiter? Fame, that told her the one, must tell her the other too.*

These are all the animadversions that Mr. B. could afford upon this topic; except a small puny cavil against an expression of mine, *the first inventor;* which shall be answered when I come to examine his exceptions to my style. But, on the next head, *the original of tragedy,* he resolves to overflow all banks with a spring-tide of learning: let the reader therefore prepare, that he be not carried away with the flood.

XI.

In the LXIII. Epistle he is in great wrath with one Aristolochus, a tragic poet that nobody ever heard of, *for writing tragedies against him,* κατ' ἐμοῦ γράφειν τραγῳδίας; and in the XCVII. he threatens Lysinus, another poet of the same stamp with the former, *for writing against him both tragedies and hexameters,* ἀλλ' ἔπη καὶ τραγῳδίας εἰς ἐμὲ γράφεις. Now, to forgive him that silly expression, of writing tragedies *against him,* for he could not be the argument of tragedy while he was living, I must take the boldness to tell him, who am out of his reach, that he lays a false crime to their charge. For there was no such thing nor word as *tragedy* while he tyrannised at Agrigentum. That we may slight that obscure story about

Epigenes the Sicyonian, Thespis, we know, was the first inventor of it, according to Horace. Neither was the name of tragedy more ancient than the thing, as sometimes it happens, when an old word is borrowed and applied to a new notion; but both were born together, the name being taken from τράγος, the *goat* that was the prize to the best poet and actor. But the first performance of Thespis's was about the LXI. Olymp.,[x] which is more than twelve years after Phalaris's death.

I had made this short reflection upon the *Epistles; That Aristolochus and Lysinus, two tragic poets mentioned there, were never heard of any where else.* This is arraigned by Mr. B. with great form and solemnity: but, before he begins, he is inclined *to guess, from Aristolochus's name, that he was a* giant *tragedian, rather than a* fairy *one* (p. 163).* But his consequences are all of a piece, both when he jests and when he's serious. For, if he argue from the etymology of his name, Aristolochus denotes a person that was good at *lurking and ambuscade;*[y] which surely is not the proper character of a *giant*. If he argue from the bigness of his name, he might have remembered that Borborocœtes and Meridarpax, the names of two heroes in *Batrachomyomachia*, make a more terrible sound than Achilles and Hector. And we have instances in our own time, that a man may be called by a great name, and yet be no *giant* in any thing.

Well, now he begins his remarks; and he finds the footsteps of this Aristolochus in a nameless piece usually printed with Censorinus: *For there is* numerus Aristolochius; *which*

[x] Marm. Arund. Suidas in Θέσπις.

[* Bentley had used the expression, "Phalaris's two *fairy* tragedians," while treating *Of Euripides's Epistles*,—a portion of his first *Dissertation* which he did not reprint, but which is added to the present edition.—D.]

[y] Λόχος.

must come from Aristolochus *a poet, as* Aristophanius *there comes from* Aristophanes (p. 163). Upon which he further enlarges: and 'tis a difficult problem, whether he shews more learning here in the margin, or more judgment in the text. The passage which he cites is thus;

Numerus Saturnius:

*Magnum numerum triumphat | hostibus devictis.**

Sunt qui hunc Archebolion *vocant.* That is, *Some call the* Saturnian *verse* Archebolion. Ludovicus Carrio makes this note upon it; *That the common editions, before his, had it* ARISTOLOCHIUM, *but the MSS.* Aristodolium. Now, to which reading of the three must we stand? to *Archebolion,* or *Aristolochium,* or *Aristodolium?* Mr. B., who will never be guilty of improving any place, leaves his reader here at large, to take which of them he pleases: only he puts in for his thirds, because *Aristolochium* has a chance to be the right, as well as either of the others. But what if I shall prove that all three are wrong, and the true lection is ARCHILOCHIUM? Then his *Aristolochus* must vanish into *fairy-land* again.

The first that used the Saturnian verse among the Latins

[* P. 2727. *ed. Putsch.* —

" v. 2511. *Post rectius probatum est*) his verbis mihi quidem Terentianus ab " antiquiorum Saturniorum genere recentius distinguere videtur: quæ confude- " runt Atilius . . . . . Bentleius adv. Boyl." &c.

" Saturnium recentiorem videtur dare voluisse Auctor Incertus c. XIV. cui " *numerus* fermè vocatur *versus* aliis dictus: *Numerus Saturnius:*

Magnum numerum triumphat *hostibus* revinctis.

" *Sunt qui hunc* Archebolion *vocant.* In quo loco certa quidem est Vineti et " Bentleii adv. Boyl. p. 123. conjectura *Archilochium.* Sed à Bentleio, non " minùs quàm ab ipso Grammatico et Atilio, p. 2680, 7. Saturnius, qui secundâ " sede ïambum requirit, cum Anapæstico Archilochio confunditur. Tum et, " quod vitiosè in Incerto mihi edi videtur, *hostibus devictis,* adversantibus non " minùs editionibus, quàm metro, Bentleius obtrudere conatur Servio Centim. " cap. ix. p. 22. 10." *Santen. ad Terent. Maur.* p. 352, 354.

Concerning the Saturnian verse, see also Hermann's *Elem. Doct. Met.* lib. iii. cap. 9.—D.]

was Nævius, an old poet before Ennius's time: the measures of the verse will be best known by examples. The two first are out of Nævius;

Novem Jovis concordes | filiæ sorores.

Ferunt pulchras pateras | aureas lepidas.[z]

The latter of which has two false measures in it, and ought to be corrected thus, out of Plotius[a] and Nonius Marcellus;[b]

Ferunt pulchras creterras, | aureas lepistas.

The following was made by the Metelli, Nævius's enemies;

Dabunt malum Metelli | Nævio poëtæ.[c]

Now, it's observed by Terentianus Maurus,[d] a most elegant writer, that the Latins were much mistaken in supposing the Saturnian verse to be an invention of their countrymen; for the original of it was from the Greeks. Fortunatianus says the same; and he adds, that it was to be met with in Euripides, and Callimachus, and ARCHILOCHUS. The instance that he brings is this, and he calls it ARCHILOCHIUM;

Quem non rationis egentem | vicit Archimedes.[*]

And so Servius[e] brings another ARCHILOCHIUM;

Remeavit ab arce tyrannus, | hostibus devictis.

These two verses, indeed, are not really Archilochus's, but

[z] Atilius Fortun. p. 2679. [*ed. Putsch.*—See *Santen. ad Terent. Maur.* p. 355.—D.]

[a] Plot. p. 2650. [*ed. Putsch.*—D.]

[b] C. de Vasis. [p. 547. *ed. Mer.* 1826.—D.]

[c] Atilius, ibid. [See *Santen. ad Terent. Maur.* p. 355.—D.]

[d] Terent. p. 2439. [=115. *ed. Santen.*—D.]

[[*] Atil. ibid.—See *Santen. ad Terent. Maur.* p. 353.—D.]

[e] Centim. p. 1825. [*ed. Putsch.*, where it is given—

"Remeavit ab arce tyrannus *vultibus cruentis.*"

See note in the preceding page.—D.]

made by those grammarians conformably to his measures: but I can give you some that are truly his own;

Ἐρασμονίδη Χαρίλαε, | χρῆμά τοι γελοῖον.
Ἀστῶν δ' οἱ μὲν κατόπισθεν | ἦσαν· οἱ δὲ πολλοί.
Ἐρέω πολὺ φίλταθ' ἑταίρων, | τέρψεαι δ' ἀκούων.
Φιλέειν στυγνόν περ ἐόντα, | μηδὲ διαλέγεσθαι.[f]

And Hephæstion assures us, *that Archilochus was the first that used this sort of verse.*[g] Now, I suppose, I scarce need to observe, that these ARCHILOCHIAN verses are the same with the SATURNIAN; the measures themselves sufficiently shew that; for there's no difference at all, but only a dactyl for a spondee or trochee; which was a common variation even in the Latin Saturnians; as in these two that follow, out of the *Tabulæ Triumphales;*

Fundit, fugat, prosternit | maximas legiones.
Duello magno dirimendo, | regibus subigendis.[h]

I have distinguished the middle pause of every verse by this mark | , that the reader, though perhaps unacquainted with this part of learning, may have a perception of the measure. And I suppose he may be pretty well satisfied that the true reading in Mr. B.'s author is not *Aristolochium,* but *Archilochium.* As for the two other names, *Aristodolium* and *Archebolion;* the former is a manifest corruption; the latter (as it seems) was in no MS. nor print, but a bare conjecture of Carrio's, and a very erroneous one, for the *Archebulion* (as he ought to have called it) had quite different measures, as will appear by these instances;

Ἀγέτω θεὸς, οὐ γὰρ ἔχω δίχα τῶν δ' ἀείδειν.[i]

[f] Hephæst. p. 48, 50. [= 83, 84, 88. *ed. Gaisf.*—D.]
[g] Πρῶτος τούτοις Ἀρχίλοχος κέχρηται. [p. 83. *ed. Gaisf.*—D.]
[h] Atilius Fort. ibid. [See *Santen. ad Terent. Maur.* p. 355.—D.]
[i] Hephæst. p. 27. [= 49. *ed. Gaisf.* The line is by Callimachus, *Fr.* CXLVI., where Bentley reads τῶδ' instead of τῶν δ'.—D.]

Tibi nascitur omne pecus, tibi crescit herba.[j]

The reader will excuse this digression, because I have given a clear emendation, where the great Mr. B. attempted it in vain; which would be an honour much more valuable, if I had it not so very often.

"But suppose," says Mr. B. "that nobody heard of these "tragedians but in Phalaris; what then? Will the Doctor "discard all poets that are but once mentioned in old "authors? What, at this rate, will become of Xenocles and "Pythangelus, whom (at least the *first* of them) the Doctor "will be hard put to't to find mentioned by any body, but "once by Aristophanes?" (p. 164.) Very *hard put to't* indeed! to find an author that is mentioned in so common a book as Ælian's *Various History*;[k] where we have both the name of this Xenocles and his age too, and the titles of four of his plays, *Œdipus*, *Lycaon*, *Bacchæ*, and *Athamas;* with which he got the prize from his antagonist Euripides, Olymp. XCI. 1. 'Tis true Ælian is in indignation at it; and *'tis ridiculous*, says he, *that this little Xenocles should carry the prize from Euripides; especially, when those plays of Euripides were some of the best that he ever made. The judges were either senseless and unlearned, or else they were bribed.* This is the just verdict and censure of impartial posterity; and Euripides, could he have foreseen it, would not have changed this posthumous honour for the applauses that Xenocles won from him. *And by the way, therefore, I would advise Mr. B.* (if I may return him his own words) *not to be too vain upon his performance* (p. 163), when he hears it cried up by those that are not competent judges. Bavius and Mævius (whom Mr. B. mentions here) had many admirers while they lived, or else they had been below the notice of Virgil and Horace. But posterity gave them their due; for that will flatter no man's quality, nor follow the clamour of a party. But to return to Xenocles; there's a fifth play of his,

[j] Atil. p. 1673. [2673.—D.]

[k] Ælian. ii. 8.

Licymnius, mentioned by the Scholiast on Aristophanes;[l] and two fragments of it are produced by Aristophanes himself. Mr. B. says he is but *once* mentioned by that poet; but, besides the passage of *Ranæ*,[m] which Mr. B. meant, there are three others,[n] where he is spoken of under the title of *the son of Carcinus*. He is mentioned too in a fragment of Plato the comedian's;

—— Ξενοκλῆς ὁ δωδεκαμήχανος,
Ὁ Καρκίνου παῖς τοῦ θαλαττίου.[o]

He was ridiculed also by Pherecrates,[p] another comic poet. And we may hear of him in Suidas in more places than one.[q] What does the Examiner mean, then, by his *putting me hard to 't?* I'll do much harder matters than this to do him any service. But, I am persuaded he was encouraged to write thus *at a venture*, because Vossius says nothing of Xenocles in his book *de Poëtis Græcis*.

If the Examiner had not had the ambitious vanity to shew, as he thought, his great reading and critic, he might fairly have escaped these two blunders about Aristolochus and Xenocles. For what is it that he is driving at? or who is it that he disputes with? Did I make that my argument against Phalaris, *that his two pretended tragedians were no where else to be heard of?* No, surely; but *because he names two tragedians in an age of the world when tragedy itself was not yet heard of.*

This, therefore, is the main point which Mr. B. and I must now contend for, *the first date and origin of tragedy*. In my *Dissertation* I espoused the opinion of those authors that make Thespis the inventor of it, professing, in express

[l] Schol. Arist. p. 120. [*Schol. to ed. Bekk.* p. 139.—D.]

[m] P. 133. [v. 86. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

[n] P. 120, 364, 464. [*Nubes*, v. 1243. *Vespæ*, v. 1508. *Pax*, v. 763. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

[o] Ib. 465. [*Schol. to ed. Bekk.* p. 213.—D.]

[p] Ib. 364. [*Schol. ibid.* p. 182.—D.]

[q] Suid. in Καρκίνος, and Σφυράδες, and Ἄξενος.

words, *that I slighted the obscure story of Epigenes the Sicyonian.* This, I think, is a sufficient proof, that I knew there were some weak pretences made to tragedy before Thespis's time; but I believed them over-balanced by better authorities. And yet what is there in this long-winded harangue of Mr. B.'s, from p. 165 to 180, but the bringing, with ostentation and grimace, those very obscure pretences which I declared I had slighted; and every bit of it (except his own faults, as usual,) scraped together at second-hand from the commonest authors? In opposition to which tedious declamation, I shall first vindicate Thespis's title to the *invention* of tragedy; and in the next place inquire into his *age;* and in the last examine Mr. B.'s performance in the same order as he has presented it.

The famous chronological inscription in the Arundel Marble, which was made Olymp. CXXIX., in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, above CCLX. years before Christ, declares that Thespis was the FIRST that gave being to tragedy;[r] *'Ἀφ' οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς . . . . . ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΕΔΙΔΑΞΕ* . . . The word *πρῶτος* is not in the printed editions; but my learned friend Dr. Mill, whom I consulted on this occasion, assures me 'tis plainly so in the Marble itself, which is now at Oxford. I shall give a further account of this by and by; but, allowing even the common reading, as it's published by Mr. Selden, yet it's evident, and agreed by all, that the author of this inscription delivers this as the first era of tragedy. Besides him, the epigrammatist Dioscorides gives the invention of it to Thespis;

Θέσπιδος εὕρεμα τοῦτο, τὰ δ' ἀγροιῶτιν ἀν' ὕλαν
Παίγνια, καὶ κώμους τούσδε τελειοτέρους
Αἰσχύλος ἐψύχωσε, νοήσιμα ετα χαράξας
Γράμματα, χειμάῤῥῳ δ' οἷα καταρδόμενα·
Καὶ τὰ κατὰ σκηνὴν μετεκαίνισεν· ὦ στόμα πάντων
*Δεξιὸν, ἀρχαίων ἦσθά τις ἡμιθέων.**

[r] Lin. 58.

[* *Anth. Gr. ex rec. Br.* (*ed. Jacobs.*) I. 248.—*Anth. Gr. ad. fid. Cod. Pal. &c.* I. 428.—D.]

Thus the epigram is published by the very learned Mr. Stanley, before his noble edition of Æschylus; and I have not now leisure to seek if it was printed any where before. In the third verse, which is manifestly corrupted, Mr. Stanley corrected it *ὀνήσιμα* for *νοήσιμα*, as appears by his translation, *utile;* the other word he leaves untouched. The epigram itself is extant in the MS. *Anthologia Epigram. Græc.*, a copy of which I have by me, by the kindness of my excellent friend the late Dr. Edward Bernard: and there the third verse is thus;

Αἰσχύλος ἐξύψωσε νονήσμια ευτα χαράξας.

Out of which disjointed words, I have extracted, as I humbly conceive, this genuine lection;*

Αἰσχύλος ἐξύψωσε, νεοσμίλευτα χαράξας
Γράμματα ——

Α, the last letter of *νονήσμια*, was mistaken for *Λ*. *Ἐξύψωσεν*, he *raised and exalted* the style of tragedy by *νεοσμίλευτα γράμματα*, his new-made and *new-carved* words: which is the very thing that Aristophanes ascribes to him;[s]

Ἀλλ' ὦ πρῶτος τῶν Ἑλλήνων πυργώσας ῥήματα σεμνά:

and the writer of his life,[t] *Ζηλοῖ τὸ ἀδρὸν* [*ἀεὶ*] *καὶ ὑπέρογκον, ΟΝΟΜΑΤΟΠΟΙΙΑΙΣ καὶ ἐπιθέτοις . . . χρώμενος*. But our epigrammatist, though he gives Æschylus the honour of improving tragedy, is as positive that *εὕρεμα the invention* of it belongs to Thespis: which will further appear from another epigram by the same hand, made upon Thespis himself, and

[* "*Ceterùm Porsonus in notis mss. ad Æschylum, postquam monuisset in* "*Dioscoridis epigrammate notissimo rectè citavisse Salmasium ibidem* [ad Sol. "p. 735, 2.] *Αἰσχύλος ἐξύψωσεν, ὁ μὴ σμιλευτὰ χαράξας Γράμματα, addit;* MS. "à Bentleio collatus habuit *ἐψύχωσε* [*ἐξύψωσε*] *νονήσμια ευτα*, unde ille parum "feliciter *νεοσμίλευτα*. *Σμιλευτὰ* ad Euripidem tacitè refertur, et imitatus est "Dioscorides Aristophanem, quem vide Ran. 814-821. 900-904. 1004, 1005. "ed. Brunck." PORS. *Notæ in Aristoph. ed. Dobree*, p. 69.—D.]

[s] Arist. Ran. p. 169. [v. 1002. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

[t] Anon. in Vitâ Æsch.

never yet published; but it's extant in the same Manuscript *Anthology;*

*Διοσκορίδου εἰς Θέσπιν τραγῳδόν.**

Θέσπις ὅδε, τραγικὴν ὃς ἀνέπλασε πρῶτος ἀοιδὴν,
Κωμήταις νεαρὰς καινοτομῶν χάριτας,
Βάκχος ὅτε τρίτον κατάγοι χορὸν ᾧ τράγος ἆθλον.
Χ' ὠτικὸς ἦν σύκων ἄρριχος ἆθλος ἔτι.
Οἱ δέ με πλάσσουσι νεοὶ, τὰ δὲ μύριος αἰὼν,
Πολλὰ πρό σευ, φήσει, χἆτερα· τἆλλα δ' ἐμά.

The second distich, which in the MS. is faulty and unintelligible, is thus, perhaps, to be corrected;

Βάκχος ὅτε τριττὸν κατάγοι χορὸν, ᾧ τράγος ἆθλον,
Χ' ὠ'ττικὸς ἦν σύκων ἄρριχος, ὕθλος ἔτι.

Cùm Bacchus ducat triplicem chorum; cui hircus,
Et cui Attica ficuum cista præmium erat, ut adhuc
fabula est.

By the three choruses of Bacchus he means the *Trina Dionysia*, the three festivals of Bacchus; the *Διονύσια τὰ ἐν Λίμναις*, the *Διονύσια τὰ κατ' ἄστυ*, and the *Διονύσια τὰ κατ' ἄγρους*; at which times, that answer to March, April, and January, both tragedies and comedies were acted. Afterwards, indeed, they added these diversions to the *Παναθήναια*, which fell out in the month of August; but, because this last was an innovation after Thespis's time, the poet here takes no notice of it. But to dismiss this; the substance of the epigram imports, *that Thespis was the* FIRST *contriver of tragedy, which was then a* NEW *entertainment.* After Dioscorides, we have Horace's testimony in Thespis's favour;

[* *Anth. Gr. ex rec. Br.* (*ed. Jacobs.*) I. 248.—*Anth. Gr. ad fid. Cod. Pal. &c.* I. 427. where see notes: the last two lines may be read—

οἱ δὲ μεταπλάσσουσι νέοι τάδε. μυρίος αἰὼν
πολλὰ προσευρήσει χἆτερα· τἆλλα δ' ἐμά. D.]

Ignotum tragicæ genus invenisse camenæ
Dicitur, et plaustris vexisse poëmata Thespis,
Quæ canerent agerentque peruncti fæcibus ora.[u]

And I think this poet's opinion is not only well explained, but confirmed too by the old Scholiast, who tells us, *Thespis was the* FIRST INVENTOR *of tragedy.*[v] To all these we may add Plutarch, whose expression implies something further, *that Thespis gave the rise and beginning to the very rudiments of tragedy:*[w] and Clemens of Alexandria, who makes Thespis *the contriver of tragedy, as Susarion was of comedy.*[x] And, without doubt, Athenæus was of the same judgment, when he said, *both comedy and tragedy were found out at Icarius, a place in Attica,*[y] for our Thespis was born there. And in another place he says; *the ancient poets, Thespis, Pratinas, Cratinus, and Phrynichus, were called* ὀρχηστικοὶ, dancers, *because they used dancing so much in their choruses.*[z] Now, if we compare this with what Aristotle says, *that tragedy in its infancy was* ὀρχηστικωτέρα, *more taken up with dances than afterwards,*[a] it will be plain that Athenæus knew no ancienter tragedian than Thespis; for, if he had, it had been to his purpose to name him. But there's a fault in that passage, which, by the way, I will correct: for Κρατῖνος, Cratinus, who is named there, was a comedian, and does not

[u] Hor. in Arte Poët. [v. 275.—D.]—[Dr. Bentley has corrected these verses concerning Thespis in his edition of Horace, published MDCCXI. But his correction there does not affect what he says here; for *plaustra* were certainly used, whether to carry the plays in, or the authors, or the players. *Note on ed.* 1777. —Bentley amended and explained the passage thus;

" *Dicitur, et plaustris vexisse poëmata Thespis*
QUI *canerent agerentque, peruncti fæcibus ora.*

" Ubi ordo est, *vexisse plaustris* [eos] *qui canerent agerentque poëmata, peruncti* " *ora fæcibus.*"—D.]

[v] Schol. in edit. Cruquii.

[w] Plut. Solon. Ἀρχομένων τῶν περὶ Θέσπιν ἤδη τὴν τραγῳδίαν κινεῖν.

[x] Clem. Strom. i. Ἐπενόησε τραγῳδίαν.

[y] Athen. p. 40. [= I. 152. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

[z] Id. p. 22. [= I. 82. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

[a] Arist. Poët. v. [= x. *ed. Tyrw.*—D.]

suit with the rest. The true reading I take to be *Καρκίνος*, Carcinus, who was an ancient tragic poet, and is burlesqued once or twice by Aristophanes for this very *dancing* humour that Athenæus speaks of.[b] He had three sons, that he brought up to dance in his choruses, who, upon that account, are called there, among many other nicknames, *ὀρχησταὶ*, *dancers*. To go on now about Thespis; Suidas acquaints us, *that Phrynichus was scholar to Thespis, who* FIRST *introduced tragedy;* and Donatus passes his word, *that, if we search into antiquity, we shall find that Thespis was the* FIRST *that* INVENTED *it*.[c] But what need we any particular witnesses? when we have Plato telling us at once, *that it was the universal opinion in his time that tragedy began with Thespis or Phrynichus;*[d] and though he himself was of a different sentiment, yet he proposes it as a paradox: and we may see what little credit his paradox had, when every one of those I have cited came after him, and yet for that matter begged his pardon.

The pretences that are made *against Thespis*, besides

[b] Arist. p. 364, 464. [*Vespæ*, v. 1501, &c. *Pax*, v. 763, &c. *ed. Bekk.*—D.] Suid. in Καρκ.

[c] Retrò prisca volventibus reperitur [reperiatur] Thespis tragœdiæ primus inventor. [*Evanth. de Tr. et Com.—Terent. ed. Wester.* I. liv.—D.]

[d] Plat. in Min. Ὡς οἴονται, ἀπὸ Θέσπιδος. [" Ἡ δὲ τραγῳδία ἔστι παλαιὸν " ἐνθάδε, οὐχ ὡς οἴονται ἀπὸ Θέσπιδος ἀρξαμένη οὐδ' ἀπὸ Φρυνίχου, ἀλλ' εἰ θέλεις " ἐννοῆσαι, πάνυ παλαιὸν αὐτὸ εὑρήσεις ὂν τῆσδε τῆς πόλεως εὕρημα. Ἔστι δὲ τῆς " ποιήσεως δημοτερπέστατόν τε καὶ ψυχαγωγικώτατον ἡ τραγῳδία. ΤΡΑΓΩΔΙΑ " is here to be taken in its larger extent. There were no *stage plays* till the " time of Thespis; and in this sense no *tragedies*. But yet there were stories " of a dramatic kind, formed into dialogue; and characters drawn, as of Minos, " a cruel king. This manner of writing was not the invention of Thespis or " Phrynichus, as people generally thought, confounding the stage with the " characteristic and dialogue manner of writing." J. Upton, Dissert. on Shakespeare, § 14. p. 119.—But still we have no proof that the word *tragedy* was known in Phalaris's time; but only some sort of dialogue, which, in Plato's opinion, was the original of tragedy. *Note on ed.* 1777.]

[That the Dialogue entitled ΜΙΝΩΣ is not the work of Plato, has, I think, been clearly proved by Boeckh. But, from several passages in ancient authors, some scholars have endeavoured to shew that the word τραγῳδία was formed before the time of Thespis, and used to signify the choral performances in the Dionysia.—D.]

some general talk (which shall be considered, when I examine Mr. B.'s advances upon this topic), are for one Epigenes a Sicyonian. This is the only person, mentioned by name, that can contest the matter with Thespis. And who is there that appears in behalf of this Epigenes? But one single witness, and he too does but tell us a hear-say, which himself seems not to believe. *Thespis*, says Suidas,[e] *is reckoned the* XVI*th tragic poet after Epigenes a Sicyonian: but some say, Thespis was the second after him; and others, the very first of all.* And again, where he explains the proverb, *Οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον*; *it was occasioned*, he says, *by a tragedy of Epigenes a Sicyonian:* but he adds, *that others give a different and better account of it.*[f] Now, if this be all that's said for Epigenes's plea, nay, if it be all that's said of him upon any account, (for I think nobody mentions him besides Suidas,*) I suppose this ill-supported pretence to tragedy will soon be overruled; unless, perhaps, the very weakness of it may invite Mr. B. to espouse the cause. For I observe, that his judgment, like other men's valour, has commonly the generosity to favour the weaker side. 'Tis true, there are two very great men, Lilius Gyraldus[g] and Gerard Vossius,[h] besides others, who affirm that this same Epigenes is cited, and some of his tragedies named, by Athenæus. If this be so, it will quite alter the case; and the trial must be called over again. But, with Mr. B.'s leave, I will once more take the boldness *to contradict great names;* for I affirm that the Epigenes in Athenæus was a comic poet, and many generations younger than his pretended namesake the tragedian. Suidas himself is my voucher; *Epigenes*, says he, *a* COMIC *poet; some of his plays are Ἡραΐνη, and Μνημάτιον, and Βακχεῖα, as Athenæus says*

[e] Suid. in Θεσπ. [f] In Οὐδὲν πρ. Διον.

[* "Nec verum est, quod ipsi [Bentleio] videtur, neminem ejus [Epigenis] "mentionem fecisse præter Suidam. Facit enim et Apostolius, et Photius in "Lexico MS. Uterque in explicatione proverbii οὐδὲν πρὸς Διόνυσον." HERMANNI *Com. ad Arist. Poët.* p. 104.—D.]

[g] Gyrald. de Poëtis. [h] Vossius de Poëticâ.

in his Deipnosophists.[i] Gyraldus, indeed, would draw this testimony over to his own side; and for *κωμικὸς* he corrects it *τραγικός*. But Athenæus himself interposes, and forbids this alteration; *Epigenes*, says he, *the* COMIC *poet, says thus in his Bacchæ*, *Ἀλλ' εἴ τις ὥσπερ χῆν' ἔτρεφέ με λαβὼν σιτευτόν.*[j] The verses are to be distinguished thus;

Ἀλλ' εἴ τις ὥσπερ χῆνά μ' ἔτρεφεν λαβὼν
Σιτευτόν—

The words themselves shew they belong to *comedy*, when they tell us of *fatted geese*. And indeed the very subject[s] of all his fragments do plainly evince it: the next tells us of *figs at a supper*;[k]

Εἶτ' ἔρχεται χελιδονίων μετ' ὀλίγον
Σκληρῶν ἁδρὸς πινάκισκος—

Correct it,

—Εἶτ' ἔρχεται
Χελιδονείων μετ' ὀλίγον σκληρῶν ἁδρὸς
Πινάκισκος—

And another out of the same play,[l] and three out of *Μνημάτιον*, and two out of *Ἡρωΐνη*, are all about *cups;* the last of which will inform us a little about the poet's age;[m]

Τὴν Θηρίκλειον δεῦρο καὶ τὰ Ῥοδιακὰ
Κόμισον—

[i] Suid. Ἐπιγ.

[j] Athen. p. 384. [= III. 417. *ed. Schw.*—D.] Ἐπιγένης ὁ κωμῳδιοποιὸς ἐν Βάκχαις.

["Read

ἀλλ' εἴτις ὥσπερ χῆν' ἐμὲ
ἔτρεφε λαβὼν σιτευτόν."

PORSON, *in his Tracts, &c. ed. by Kidd*, p. 315.—D.]

[k] P. 75. [= I. 296. *ed. Schw.*—D.] Ἐπιγένης ἐν Βραγχίᾳ. [Βακχείᾳ.—D.]

[l] P. 498. [= IV. 351. *ed. Schw.*—D.] Ἐπιγ. ἐν Βακχίᾳ. [Βακχείᾳ.—D.]

[m] Athen. p. 502. [= IV. 369. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

Fetch hither the Thericlean and the Rhodian cups: for, by his naming the THERICLEAN cup,[n] we may be sure he was no older than Aristophanes's time; nay, that he was considerably younger, Jullius Pollux will assure us;[o] where he calls him one of the writers of *new comedy: Τῶν δὲ νέων τις κωμικῶν Ἐπιγένης ἐν Ποντικῷ* [ἔφη], *Τρεῖς μόνους σκώληκας ἔτι, τούτους δέ μ' ἔασον καταγαγεῖν.* The measures of the verses are thus;

——*Τρεῖς μόνους*
Σκώληκας ἔτι· τούτους δέ μ' ἔασον καταγαγεῖν.

Well, I hope I have fully shewn, without offending their ashes, that Gyraldus and Vossius were mistaken about Epigenes. I would only add, that we ought to correct in Suidas *Ἡρωΐνη* for *Ἡραΐνη*, and *Βακχεία* for *Βακχεῖα*; and I take the three words in Athenæus, *Βάκχαις*, *Βραγχία*, and *Βακχία*, to be so many depravations of one and the same title of a play.

The reader will please to take notice of Phalaris's expression, *that Aristolochus* WROTE *tragedies against him;*[p] and to remember too, what I have shewed before, that both comedies and tragedies for some time were unpremeditated and extemporal, neither published nor written. Allowing, then, that this Epigenes, or any other Sicyonian, started tragedy before Thespis, still it will not bring Phalaris off; unless his advocate can shew that tragedy was *written* before Thespis's time. But there's no ground nor colour for such an assertion; none of the ancients countenance it; no tragedy is ever cited older than he. Donatus says expressly, he was the first that *writ;* and it's incredible, that the belief of his first inventing tragedy should so universally obtain, as we have shewn it did, if any tragedies of an older author had been extant in the world. Nay, I will go a step further, and freely own my opinion, *that even Thespis himself pub-*

[n] See here, p. 169, &c.
[o] Poll. vii. 10.
[p] Ep. 63. ΓΡΑΦΕΙΝ *τραγῳδίας.*

lished nothing in writing; and if this be made out, the present argument against the *Epistles* will still be the stronger. Though, even without it, it's unanswerable, if Thespis be younger than the true Phalaris, which I will prove by and by. But I expect now to hear a clamour against *paradoxes, and opposing great authors upon slight or no grounds;* for the Arundel Marble mentions the Ἄλκηστις of Thespis, and Julius Pollux his Πενθεύς, and Suidas four or five more; and Plutarch, with Clemens Alexand., produce some of his verses. No question but these are strong prejudices against my new assertion, or rather suspicion; but the sagacious reader will better judge of it when he has seen the reasons I go upon.

This I lay down as the foundation of what I shall say on this subject, that the famous Heraclides of Pontus set out his own tragedies in Thespis's name. *Aristoxenus the musician says* (they are the words of Diogenes Laërt.[q]), *that Heraclides made tragedies, and put the name of Thespis to them.* This Heraclides was a scholar of Aristotle's; and so was Aristoxenus too, and even a greater man than the other: so that I conceive one may build upon this piece of history as a thing undeniable.

Now, before the date of this forgery of Heraclides's, we have no mention at all of any of Thespis's remains. Aristotle, in his *Poetry,* speaks of the origin and progress and perfection of tragedy; he reads a lecture of critic upon the fables of the first writers: yet he has not one syllable about any piece of Thespis's. This will seem no small indication that nothing of his was preserved; but there's a passage in Plato that more manifestly implies it. *Tragedy,* says he, *is an ancient thing, and did not commence, as people think, from Thespis nor from Phrynichus.*[r] Now, from hence I infer, if several persons in Plato's time believed tragedy was

[q] Laërt. Herac. Φησὶ δ' Ἀριστόξενος ὁ μουσικὸς καὶ τραγῳδίας αὐτὸν ποιεῖν, καὶ Θέσπιδος αὐτὰς ἐπιγράφειν.

[r] Plato in Minoe. [See note p. 285.—D.]

invented by Phrynichus, they must never have seen nor heard of any tragedies of Thespis. For, if they had, there could have been no controversy, which of the two was the inventor; for the one was a whole generation younger than the other. But Thespis's tragedies being lost, and Phrynichus's being the ancientest that were preserved, it was an inducement to several to believe him the first author.

'Tis true, indeed, that, after the time of Heraclides, we have a few fragments of Thespis's quoted, and the names of some of his plays; but I will now shew that every one of those passages are cited from Heraclides's counterfeit tragedies, and not the works of the true Thespis.

As for the author of the Arundel Marble, who was but a little younger than Heraclides and Aristoxenus, and might possibly know them both, he is commonly indeed supposed to mention Thespis's *Ἄλκηστις*; for Mr. Selden, from the broken pieces of the inscription, concluded that to be the true reading; and his conjecture has been embraced by all that have come after him. I myself too was formerly of the same opinion; but, being now more concerned to examine narrowly into it, I am fully satisfied that we were all mistaken. The words of the Marble are these, as Mr. Selden copied them; *Αφ ου Θεσπις ο ποιητης . . . . . αχι . . . ος εδιδαξεν αλ . . . . στιν . . . . τεθηο . . . . ραγος . . . . . .* But the Reverend Dr. Mill assures me that at present there's nothing of *ΑΛ . . . ΣΤΙΝ* to be seen; and, if any thing can be made of the first letter, it seems to be *Ο* rather than *Α*. I suppose it's plain enough already, from the epoch about Susarion,[8] that Mr. Selden was not over-accurate in copying the inscription; and this very place before us is another proof of it, for instead of *ΑΧΙ . . . ΟΣ*, as he published it, I am informed, by the same very good hand, that it's yet legibly and plainly *ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΟΣ*. But, besides the uncertainty of this *Αλ . . . στιν*, which is now wholly defaced in the Marble, the very inscription itself evinces that it

[8] See above, p. 257.

ought not to be read *ΑΛΚΗΣΤΙΝ*. For the author of it never sets down the name of any *play;* not when he gives the date of Æschylus's first victory;[t] not when he speaks of Sophocles's;[u] not where he mentions Euripides's;[v] nor upon any other occasion. And 'tis utterly improbable that he would do it in one single place, and omit it in so many others that equally deserved it. Add to all this the express testimony of Suidas, *that Phrynichus was the first that made women the subject of tragedy;*[w] his master Thespis having introduced nobody but men. There could be no play, therefore, of Thespis's with the title of *Alcestis*.

I shall now consider the passage in Clemens Alexandrinus. *Thespis the tragic poet,* says that very excellent author, *writes thus;*[x]

> *Ἴδε σοι σπένδω ΚΝΑΞΖΒΙ τὸ λευκὸν,*
> *Ἀπὸ θηλαμόνων θλίψας κνακῶν.*
> *Ἴδε σοι ΧΘΥΠΤΗΝ τυρὸν μίξας*
> *Ἐρυθρῷ μέλιτι, κατὰ τῶν σῶν, Πὰν*
> *Δικέρως, τίθεμαι βωμῶν ἁγίων.*
> *Ἴδε σοι Βρομίου αἴθοπα ΦΛΕΓΜΟΝ*
> *Λείβω——*

This supposed fragment of Thespis, as Clemens himself explains it, and as I have further proved out of Porphyry,[y] relates to those four artificial words, *κναξζβὶ, χθύπτης, φλεγμὼ, δρόψ,* which comprehend exactly the whole XXIV. letters of the Greek alphabet. Now I say, if these XXIV. letters were not all invented in Thespis's time, this cannot be a genuine fragment of his. The consequence, I think, is so very plain, that even Mr. B., with his new System of Logic, cannot give us a better. We must know then, that it was a long time after the use of Greek writing, nay, of

[t] Lin. 65. [u] Lin. 72. [v] Lin. 76.

[w] Suid. in *Φρυν.* *Πρῶτος γυναικεῖον πρόσωπον εἰσήγαγεν.*

[x] Clem. Strom. v. *Θέσπις ὁ τραγικὸς . . . . ὧδέ πως γράφων.* [p. 675. *ed. Pott.* —D.]

[y] See my Dissert. upon Malal. p. 47, 48, 49. [*ed.* 1691.—D.]

writing books too, before the Greek alphabet was perfected, as it now is, and has been for 2000 years. 'Tis true, there were then the very same sounds in pronunciation (for the language was not altered); but they did not express them the same way in writing. *E* served in those days for both *E* and *H*; as one English E serves now for two distinct sounds in THEM and THESE. So *O* stood for both *O* and *Ω*: and the sound of *Z* was expressed by *ΔΣ*, of Ξ by *ΚΣ*, of Ψ by *ΠΣ*: and the three aspirates were written thus, *TH*, *ΠH*, *ΚH*, which were afterwards *Θ*, *Φ*, *X*. At that time we must imagine the first verse of Homer to have been written thus;

ΜΕΝΙΝ ΑΕΙΔΕ ΘΕΑ ΠΕΛΕΙΑΔΕΟ ΑΚΗΙΛΕΟΣ.

And the same manner of writing was in Thespis's time; because the alphabet was not completed till after his death. For it's universally agreed, that either Simonides, or Epicharmus, or both, invented some of the letters. Pliny says, *that Z H Ψ Ω are reported to be Simonides's; and that Aristotle says there were* XVIII. *old letters; and believes that Θ and X were added by Epicharmus, rather than Palamedes.*[z] Marius Victorinus says, *Simonides invented Θ Φ X.*[a] *Simonides added four*, says Hyginus, *and Epicharmus two*:[b] but Jo. Tzetzes says, *Epicharmus added three, and Simonides two.*[c] But these little differences are of no consequence in our present argument; for the whole XXIV. are mentioned in this pretended fragment of Thespis's. 'Tis sufficient, then, for our purpose, if any of them were invented either by Epicharmus or Simonides. For Epicharmus could not be above XXVII. years old, and very probably was much younger at Olymp. LXI., which is the latest period of Thespis: and Simonides at the same time was but XVI. as we have it upon his own word.[d] Now, to waive the autho-

[z] Plin. vii. 56. Simonidem Melicum Z H Ψ Ω.... Aristoteles xviii. priscas fuisse, et duas ab Epicharmo additas Θ X, quam à Palamede mavult.

[a] Mar. Victorinus, p. 2459.

[b] Hygin. Fab. 277.

[c] Tzet. Chil. xii. 398. [p. 441. *ed. Kiess.*—D.]

[d] See above, p. 110.

rity of the rest, even Aristotle alone, who could know the truth of what he said from so many inscriptions written before Epicharmus's time and still extant in his own, is a witness infallible. This passage, therefore, ascribed to Thespis is certainly a cheat; and, in all probability, it's taken from one of the spurious plays that Heraclides fathered upon him.

In the next place I will shew that all the other passages quoted from Thespis are belonging to the same imposture. Zenobius informs us, *that at first the choruses used to sing a dithyramb to the honour of Bacchus; but in time the poets left that off, and made the giants and centaurs the subject of their plays. Upon which the spectators mocked them, and said, That was nothing to Bacchus. The poets therefore sometimes introduced the Satyrs, that they might not seem quite to forget the god of the festival.*[e] To the same purpose we are told by Suidas,[f] *that at first the subject of all the plays was Bacchus himself, with his company of Satyrs; upon which account those plays were called σατυρικά: but afterwards, as tragedies came in fashion, the poets went off to fables and histories;*[g] *which gave occasion to that saying, This is nothing to Bacchus.* And he adds, *that Chamæleon says the same thing in his book about Thespis.*[h] This Chamæleon was a very learned man, and a scholar of Aristotle's. And we may gather from the very name of this treatise of his, that Thespis was some way concerned in this alteration of tragedy: either he was the last man that used all satyrical plays, or the first man that left them off. But whether of the two it was, we could not determine, unless Plutarch had helped us out in't: *When Phrynichus and Æschylus,* says he, *turned the subject of tragedy to fables and doleful stories, the people said, What's this to Bacchus?*[i] For it's evident,

[e] Zenob. v. 40. Αἴαντας καὶ κενταύρους λέγειν [γράφειν. ed. Schot.—D.] ἐπεχείρουν. Perhaps the true reading is γίγαντας.

[f] Suid. in Οὐδὲν πρὸς Διον. [g] Εἰς μύθους καὶ ἱστορίας ἐτράπησαν.

[h] Χαμαιλέων ἐν τῷ περὶ Θέσπιδος.

[i] Plut. Symp. l. i. c. 1. Φρυνίχου καὶ Αἰσχύλου τὴν τραγῳδίαν εἰς μύθους καὶ πάθη προαγόντων.

from this passage of Plutarch, compared with the others before, that the true Thespis's plays were all satyrical; (that is, the plot of them was the story of Bacchus, the chorus consisted of Satyrs, and the argument was merry;) and that Phrynichus and Æschylus were the first introducers of the new and doleful tragedy. Even after the time of Thespis, the serious tragedy came on so slowly, that of fifty plays of Pratinas, who was in the next generation after Thespis, two and thirty are said to have been satyrical.[j]

But let us apply now this observation to the fragments ascribed to Thespis, one of which is thus quoted by Plutarch;[k]

Ὁρᾷς ὅτι Ζεὺς τῷδε πρωτεύει θεῶν,
Οὐ ψεῦδος οὐδὲ κόμπον, οὐ μωρὸν γέλων
Ἀσκῶν· τὸ δ' ἡδὺ μοῦνος οὐκ ἐπίσταται.

What differs this, says Plutarch, *from that saying of Plato, That the Deity was situated remote from all pleasure and pain?*[l] Why, truly, it differs not at all; and I think there needs no other proof, that it could not belong to a satyrical ludicrous play, such as all Thespis's were. For surely this is not the language of Bacchus and his Satyrs; nay, I might say it's too high and philosophical a strain even for Thespis himself. But suppose the author could have reached so elevated a thought; yet he would never have put it into the mouth of that drunken voluptuous god, or his wanton attendants. Even Æschylus, the grave reformer of the stage, would rarely or never bring in his heroes talking sentences and philosophy, believing that to be against the genius and constitution of tragedy:[m] much less then would Thespis have done so, whose tragedies were nothing but droll. 'Tis incredible, therefore, that this fragment should be genuine; and we may know at whose door to lay it, from the hint

[j] Suid. in Πρατ.

[k] Plut. de Aud. Poët. Τὰ δὲ τοῦ Θέσπιδος ταυτί.

[l] Πόῤῥω ἡδονῆς καὶ λύπης Ἵδρυται τὸ θεῖον.

[m] Τὸ γνωμολογικὸν ἀλλότριον τῆς τραγῳδίας ἡγούμενος. Vita Æsch.

afforded us by Plutarch, though he was not aware of it. For the thought, as he has shewn us, was Plato's; and to whom then should the fragment belong but to Heraclides, the counterfeit Thespis, who was at first a scholar of Plato's,[n] and might borrow the notion from his old master?

Another verse is quoted by Julius Pollux[o] out of Thespis's *Pentheus;*

Ἔργῳ νόμιζε νευρίδας ἔχειν ἐπενδύτην.

Where for νευρίδας ἔχειν, we may correct it νεβρὶδ' ἔχειν.* Now, the very titles of this play Πενθεὺς, and of the others mentioned by Suidas, Ἆθλα Πελίου ἢ Φόρβας, and Ἱερεῖς and Ἠίθεοι, do sufficiently shew that they cannot be satyrical plays; and consequently not Thespis's, who made none but of that sort.† The learned Casaubon,[p] after he has taught us, from the ancients, that Thespis was the inventor of satyrical plays; *Yet among the plays,* says he, *that are ascribed to Thespis, there's not one that appears to have been satyrical. Πενθεὺς, indeed, seems to promise the fairest to be so; but we have observed that the old poets never brought the Satyrs into the story of Pentheus.* I have willingly used the words of Casaubon, though I do not owe the observation to him, because his judgment must needs appear free and unbiassed, since he had no view nor suspicion of the consequence I now make from it. For the result of the whole is this; that there was nothing published by Thespis himself; and that Heraclides's forgeries imposed upon Clemens, and Plutarch, and Pollux, and others. Which, by the way, would be some

[n] Laërt. Heracl.

[o] Poll. vii. 13. [=vii. 12. p. 717. *ed. Hemst.*—D.] Θέσπις ἐν τῷ Πενθεῖ.

[* "νεβρὶδ' ἔχειν is one of the few plausible alterations submitted by Dr. "Edward Bernard in one of his letters to R. B., p. 186. [*ed. Burn*]: on which "R. B. observes, Idem profectò mihi in mentem venerat, meritò verò repudiavi. "Quis enim sensus et sententia? p. 156." *Addenda to Porson's Tracts, &c. by Kidd,* p. 379.—D.]

[† Schneider endeavours unsuccessfully to controvert this opinion: see *De Orig. Trag. Gr.* p. 53-4.—D.]

[p] Casaub. de Sat. p. 157 and 30.

excuse for Mr. B. if his obstinate persisting in his first mistake did not too widely distinguish his case from theirs.

The next thing that I am to debate with Mr. B. is the age of the true Thespis. And the witness that upon all accounts deserves to be first heard is the author of the Arundel Marble; for he's the ancientest writer now extant that speaks of his age; he is the most accurate in his whole performance, and particularly he was curious and inquisitive into the history of poetry and the stage, as appears from the numerous eras there belonging to the several poets; and, which is as considerable an advantage as any, we have the original stone still among us; so that his numbers (where they are still legible) are certainly genuine, and not liable, as written books are, to be altered and interpolated by the negligence or fraud of transcribers. The remaining letters of Thespis's epoch are these; *Ἀφ' οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς . . . . πρῶτος ὃς καὶ ἐδίδαξεν . . . . τέθη ὁ . . ράγος*: which imply, almost as manifestly as if the whole was entire, *that Thespis* FIRST *invented tragedy, and the* GOAT *was made the prize for it.* The very year indeed when this was done cannot now be known from the Marble, for the numbers are worn out by time and weather; but we can approach as near to it as the present argument requires. For we are sure it must be some year in the interval between the preceding and following epochs, because the whole inscription proceeds in due order and succession of time. Now, the preceding epoch is, *Cyrus's victory over Crœsus, and the taking of Sardes;*[q] which, as all the best chronologers, Scaliger, Lydiate, Petavius, &c. agree, was Olymp. LIX. 1.; or, at lowest, at Olymp. LVIII. 2. The following is, *The beginning of Darius's reign,*[r] Olymp. LXV. 1. But, if tragedy was invented by Thespis between the Olympiads LIX. 1. and LXV. 1., how could Phalaris have intelligence of it, who was put to death before, at Olymp. LVII. 3.?

[q] Lin. 57. [r] Lin. 59.

This account in the Marble establishes, and is mutually established by, the testimony of Suidas, who informs us, *that Thespis made* (the first) *play at Olymp.* LXI.;[s] which period falls in between the two epochs that go before and after Thespis. And Mr. Selden, who first published the inscription, and viewed and measured the stone, supplies the numbers there from this passage of Suidas; and *the space,* he says, *where the letters are defaced agree*[*s*] *with that supplement.*[t] Mr. Selden has been followed by every body since; and Suidas's date is confirmed by another date about Phrynichus, Thespis's scholar. *For Phrynichus taught at Olymp.* LXVII.,[u] which is XXIV. years after Thespis, and is a competent distance of age between the scholar and the master. But if Mr. B. will still protest against this supplement of the Marble, let him do here as he did before in the epoch of Susarion, *take fairly the middle of the account* (p. 141.) between the two epochs before and after it. And what will he get by it? The former epoch is Olymp. LIX. 1.; the latter, LXV. 1. The middle of these two is Olymp. LXII. 1.; which is IV. years later than Suidas himself places him.

But let us see Mr. B.'s noble attempt to invalidate this testimony of the Arundel Marble; for, like a young Phaëton, he mounts the chariot, and boldly offers to drive through the loftiest region of critic; but he is tumbled down headlong in a most miserable manner. The thing he enterprises is this; he charges the *graver* of the Marble with an omission of a whole line, or perhaps of several; for this he does not determine (p. 168). The original paper, which the graver was to copy, he supposes to have been thus;

Ἀφ' οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς . . . . . .
. . . . . .
Ἀφ' οὗ Φρύνιχος ὁ ποιητὴς . . . . . *αχι* . . . . . *ος*
ἐδίδαξεν αλ . . . . *στιν* . . . . *τέθη ὁ* . . *ράγος* . . . . . .

The space between *Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς* and *Ἀφ' οὗ Φρυνιχος,*

[s] Suid. in *Θέσπις.* *Ἐδίδαξεν ἐπὶ τῆς α' καὶ ξ' Ὀλυμπιάδος.*
[t] Spatio lacunæ annuente. [u] Suid. *Φρύνιχος.*

which is now omitted by the *negligence of the graver*, contained, as he imagines, the *epoch* belonging to Thespis, that is, the name and the date of his play, and of the Athenian archon. But, when the graver had cut the first line, as far as ποιητὴς, he unluckily *throws his eye upon the lower line, and finding the word* ποιητὴς *there in the same situation, he thinks himself right, and goes on with the rest that followed it* (p. 168); and so tacks the *epoch* to Thespis which really and in the original belonged to Phrynichus. This wonderful achievement our Examiner seems mightily pleased with (p. 169); he inculcates it once and twice, and applauds his own sagacity in it: but perhaps he will be a warning hereafter to all *young* and unfledged *writers*, to learn to go, before they pretend to fly.

The pretences for this charge upon the *Marble-graver* are so very weak and precarious, so improper and useless to Mr. B.'s own design, that I confess I should be wholly astonished at his management, if I was not now a little acquainted with this *odd work of his* (p. 68), as himself calls it. His first pretence is, *that* Ἄλκηστις, *which the graver has made to be Thespis's play, was the name of a play of Phrynichus; but is no where reckoned among Thespis's but here* (p. 168). But I have already shewn,[v] that Ἄλκηστιν was only a supplement of Mr. Selden's, and a very false conjecture, from the dim letters *ΑΛ . . . ΣΤΙΝ*, which now are quite vanished: and that really neither Ἄλκηστις, nor any other title of a play, are mentioned in the Marble. But suppose it was Ἄλκηστις there; pray where is the consequence that Mr. B. would infer from it? Did Thespis make no tragedies but what are mentioned by Suidas? Does not Suidas himself expressly say, *that those were the names of* SOME *of his plays;*[w] not ALL that he ever made? And what an admirable argument is it; Alcestis *was a play of Phrynichus's, therefore none of Thespis's had the same title!* As

[v] See here, p. 290.

[w] Suid. Θεσπ. Τῶν δραμάτων αὐτοῦ, Ἄθλα Πελίου, &c.; not τὰ δράματα.

if the same story and the same persons were not introduced over and over again by different hands! Among the few tragedies that are yet extant, we have an Ἤλεκτρα of Sophocles, and another Ἤλεκτρα too of Euripides. Nay, besides this very Ἄλκηστις of Phrynichus, and another called Φοίνισσαι, there was an Ἄλκηστις and Φοίνισσαι of Euripides too, both which are still in being. Why then might not Phrynichus write one tragedy after Thespis, as well as Euripides write two after him?

The next pretence for accusing the *Marble-graver* of an omission of some lines is, *because it's a case that is known often to have happened in the copying of manuscripts* (p. 168). Here's another consequence the very twin to that which went before. *Because omissions often happen in copying of MSS., therefore this* IS *an omission in the epoch of Thespis.* If this argument had any force in't, it would equally hold against all the other epochs of this Marble, and against all Marbles and MSS. whatsoever. For what will be able to stand the shock, if this can be thrown down by saying, *that omissions often happen?* Mr. B., if he would make good his indictment against the graver, ought to prove, from the place itself, from the want of connexion, or some other defect there, that there's just reason to suspect some lines have been left out. But to accuse him upon this general pretence, because *other copiers have been negligent*, has exactly as much sense and equity in it, as if Mr. B. should be charged with meddling in what he understands not, and exposing his ignorance, *because it's a case that is known often to have happened in the crude books of* young writers. And besides this, there's another infirmity that this argument labours under. For though a copier may sometimes miss a line or two, by taking off his eye, yet, if he have but the common diligence at last to compare his copy with the original, he discovers his own omissions, and presently rectifies them; and by this means it comes to pass, that such deficiencies in the texts of MSS. are generally supplied and perfected by the same hand in the margin. Though we

should suppose, therefore, that the stone-cutter might carelessly miss something, yet can we suppose too that the author of the inscription would never read what was engraved there? Would a person of learning and quality, as he appears to have been, who had taken such accurate pains to deduce a whole series of chronology from before Deucalion's deluge to his own time, and for the benefit of posterity to engrave it upon marble, and set it up in a conspicuous place as a public monument, be at last so stupidly negligent as not to examine the stone-cutter's work, where the missing of a single letter in the numbers of any era would make the computation false, and spoil the author's whole design? What mad work would it make then, if, as Mr. B. affirms, whole lines were omitted by the stone-cutter, and passed uncorrected? Is it possible that the worthy author of the monument (I might say perhaps *the authors*, for it seems to have been done at a public charge,) should act so inconsistently? Mr. B., if he pleases, may think so, or affirm it without thinking; but when he catches me affirming it, I'll give him leave to tell me again, in his well-bred way, *that my head has no brains in't.*

For the epoch itself assures me, that there was no omission here by the stone-cutter. The words are, *Ἀφ' οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς . . . . . πρῶτος ὃς καὶ ἐδίδαξεν . . . τέθη ὁ . . ράγος.* Now, if all the words after *ποιητὴς* belong to Phrynichus, as Mr. B. says, and not to Thespis, as the stone-cutter says, pray what's the meaning of *ΠΡΩΤΟΣ*, FIRST? Thespis, I know, FIRST *invented tragedy*, and that was worthy of being recorded here, as the invention of comedy was before. But what did Phrynichus FIRST find out, that deserved to be named here? Why, he FIRST *brought in women into the subject of his plays*;[x] which is a business of less moment than that of Æschylus, who *first* added a second actor; or of Sophocles, who added a third; yet neither of these two improvements are registered in the

[x] Suid. *Φρυν.*

Marble: and why then should that of Phrynichus be mentioned, when theirs are omitted? But I will not charge it as a fault upon Mr. B. that he neglected to gather this hint from the word *ΠΡΩΤΟΣ*; for the common editions of the Marble have it not. But I'm afraid he will not easily excuse himself for not observing the next words, .. *τέθη ὁ .. ράγος*, which have been always hitherto thought to signify, *that the* GOAT *was made the prize of tragedy*. Now, certainly the proper place of mentioning this *prize* was at the epoch of Thespis, the inventor of *tragedy;* for so the prizes of comedy, *the cask of wine and the basket of figs*, are mentioned in the epoch of Susarion, the inventor of comedy. And what a blindness was it in Mr. B. not to observe this, when he so boldly tells the stone-cutter and the man that set him on work, that they have dropped a whole line, and that these words belong to Phrynichus? Pray what could *ΤΡΑΓΟΣ*, the GOAT, have to do in the epoch of Phrynichus? Does Mr. B. believe that sorry prize was continued after tragedy came into reputation? Would Phrynichus, or any body for him, have been at the charge of a stage, and all the ornaments of a chorus and actors, for the hopes of winning a goat, that would hardly pay for one vizard? In the following epochs of Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, &c. there's no mention of the *goat;* and if this epoch had belonged to Phrynichus, no *goat* had been here neither.

But Mr. B. the rather suspects *that the graver did make an omission*, because *the next era in the Marble falls as low as Olymp.* LXVII.; *before which time it is not to be doubted but the* Alcestis *of Phrynichus* (*that Phrynichus who was Thespis's scholar*) *was acted** (p. 168). Now, with his leave, I shall make bold to ask him one question, in words of his own, *Whether it was proper and prudent in him to accuse the* stone-cutter *of* negligence, *by an* argument that discovers a shameful *negligence* in himself? (p. 143.) For the *next era is not so low as Olymp.* LXVII. As Mr. Selden has published

[* "*added*" in the old ed., by a misprint.—D.]

it, 'tis but Olymp. LXV. 4. But, without doubt, Mr. Selden mistook the letters of the inscription (as the learned Dr. Prideaux observed before me), and for *III* read *III*, *i. e.* 3 instead of 6. So that the true era that comes next after Thespis is Olymp. LXV. 1.; but the era that Mr. B. speaks of, Olymp. LXVII., is the *next but one* after Thespis. Is not Mr. B. now an accurate writer, and a fit person to correct a stone-cutter? Or shall we blame his Assistant, *that consulted books for him?* (Pref.) But the Assistant may be rather supposed to have writ this passage right; and the mistake be Mr. B.'s; *for that is a case known often to have happened in the copying of manuscripts* (p. 168).

But the gentleman makes amends, with telling us a piece of most certain news; *for it is not to be doubted*, he says, *but the* Alcestis *of Phrynichus was acted before Olymp.* LXVII. (p. 168.) Now, I would crave leave to inquire of him, how he came to hear this news? But perhaps he'll tell me, *I may as well ask, how he came to hear his name was Phrynichus? Fame, that told him the one, must tell him the other too* (p. 161). But, if he do not trust too much to *Fame*, (which I advise him not to do, for she often changes sides), I would then tell him a piece of news, quite contrary to his; *that it is not to be doubted but* Alcestis *was* NOT *acted before Olymp.* LXVII. Because that Olympiad was the very first time that Phrynichus wrote for the stage; and he was alive, and made plays still, XXXV. years after. I will tell him too some other particulars about this Phrynichus; but, before I do that, he'll give me leave to expostulate a little about his conduct in this quarrel with the stone-cutter: the whole ground of which, as the case plainly appears, was this. Mr. B. would have Thespis placed earlier in the Marble than Olymp. LXI., because Phalaris was dead before that Olympiad, and consequently could not hear of tragedy unless Thespis was earlier. Upon this he indites the stone-cutter for an idle fellow, who, after he had graved *'Αφ' οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς*, skipped a whole line, and tacked the words which concerned Phrynichus to the name of Thespis.

Now, allowing that the poor stone-cutter should confess this and plead guilty, pray what advantage would Mr. B. and his *Sicilian prince* get by't? For, let it be as he would have it, *Ἀφ' οὗ ὁ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς* . . . . and that the line that should have come after was really omitted. Yet, however, since THESPIS is named there, there was something said about him in the very original which the graver should have copied; and though the era of it be lost, by the *graver's negligence*, yet we are sure, from the method of the whole inscription, that this lost era must needs be later than that which comes before it. But the era that comes before it, *Cyrus's victory over Crœsus*, is Olymp. LIX. 1., or at soonest LVIII. 2. And the death of Phalaris, as Mr. B. himself allows through all his *Examination*, was at Olymp. LVII. 3. What is it, then, that he aims at in his charge against the stone-cutter? Could he carry his point against him never so clearly, yet his Phalaris is still in the very same condition; for he died, we see, VIII. years, or V. at least, before Thespis is spoken of in the *original* inscription. And is not this a substantial piece of *dulness* ('tis one of his own civil words), to make all this bustle about omissions in the Marble, when, if all he asks be allowed him, he is but just as he was before? I am afraid his readers will be tempted to think, that, whether the stone-cutter was so or no, his accuser has here shewed himself a very ordinary workman.

Having thus vindicated the *graver* of the inscription from the insults of our Examiner, I shall now put in a word in behalf of the *author* of it. That excellent writer here tells us that the *first* performance of Thespis was after Olymp. LIX. 1. For this is the plain import of his words; and those learned men, *who have taken pains to illustrate this chronicle* (p. 141.), have all understood 'em so. But Mr. B. will not take up with this authority; for he affirms, *some of Thespis's plays were acted about Olymp.* LIII.; *and if this here about Olymp.* LX. *was his, it was rather one of his last than the first: but his real opinion is, that it was neither his first nor last, but Phrynichus's play erroneously applied to Thespis*

(p. 168, 169). Now, in answer to this, I dare undertake, from the same topic that Mr. B. uses, *i. e. a comparison of Thespis's age with Phrynichus's*, to prove the very contrary; that this play about Olymp. LX. could not be Phrynichus's, and that in all probability 'twas the very first of Thespis.

Suidas, to whom the whole learned world confess themselves much obliged for his accounts of the age and works of so many authors, tells us, *Phrynichus was Thespis's scholar;*[y] and Mr. B. himself expressly affirms the same (p. 168). Plato names them both together, as pretenders to the invention of tragedy; where he says, *that tragedy did not begin, as men believe, from Thespis nor from Phrynichus.*[z] And if any one will infer from this passage of Plato, that the two poets were nearer of an age than master and scholar usually are, he will make my argument against Phalaris so much the stronger; for by this means Thespis will be nearer to Phrynichus's age, and remoter from Phalaris's. But I am willing to suppose, with Mr. B., that Phrynichus was scholar to Thespis: so that, if we can but fix the scholar's age, we may gather from thence the age of the master. Now Phrynichus made a tragedy at Athens, which he intituled *Μιλήτου ἅλωσις, The taking of Miletus. Callisthenes says,* (they are the words of Strabo,) *that Phrynichus the tragic poet was fined by the Athenians a thousand drachms for making a tragedy called* The taking of Miletus by Darius.[a] And Herodotus, an older author than he: *When Phrynichus,* says he, *exhibited his play,* The taking of Miletus, *the whole theatre fell into tears, and fined the poet a thousand drachms; and made an order, that nobody ever after should make a play of that subject.*[b] The same thing is reported by Plutarch,[c] Ælian,[d] Libanius,[e] Ammianus Marcellinus,[f] the Scholiast on

[y] Suid. in *Φρυν.* *Μαθητὴς Θέσπιδος.*

[z] Plato in Minoe. [See note p. 285.—D.]

[a] Strabo, xiv. p. 635. *Μιλήτου ἅλωσιν ὑπὸ Δαρείου.*

[b] Herod. vi. c. 21.

[c] Plut. Præc. Reip. gerendæ.

[d] Æl. xii. 17.

[e] Liban. tom. i. p. 506.

[f] Amm. xxviii. 1.

Aristophanes,[g] and Joh. Tzetzes.[h] But the taking of Miletus, the whole story of which is related by Herodotus, was either at Olymp. LXX. or LXXI., as all chronologers are agreed. And, the tragedy of Phrynichus being made upon that subject, we are sure that he must be alive after Olymp. LXX. But there's another tragedy of his, called *Φοίνισσαι*, which will shew him to have been still alive above XX. years after that Olympiad. It is cited by the Scholiast on Aristophanes;[i] and Athenæus[j] gives us an iambic out of it;

Ψαλμοῖσιν ἀντίσπαστ' ἀείδοντες μέλη.

But the writer of the Argument of Æschylus's *Persæ* has the most particular account of it; *Glaucus*, says he, *in his book about the subjects of Æschylus's plays, says*[k] *his* Persæ *were borrowed from the* Phœnissæ *of Phrynichus; the first verse of which* Phœnissæ *is this;*

Τάδ' ἐστὶ Περσῶν τῶν πάλαι βεβηκότων;

and an eunuch is introduced, bringing the news of Xerxes's defeat,[l] *and setting chairs for the ministers of state to sit down on.* Now, it's evident from this fragment that Phrynichus was yet alive after Xerxes's expedition, *i. e.* Olymp. LXXV. 1. Nay, three years after this Olympiad he made a tragedy at Athens, and carried the victory; Themistocles being at the charge of all the furniture of the scene and chorus,[m] who in memory of it set up this inscription: *ΘΕΜΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ ΦΡΕΑΡΙΟΣ ΕΧΟΡΗΓΕΙ· ΦΡΥΝΙΧΟΣ ΕΔΙΔΑΣΚΕΝ· ΑΔΕΙΜΑΝΤΟΣ ΗΡΧΕΝ, i. e. Themistocles, of the parish of Phreari, was at the charge; Phrynichus made the tragedy; and Adimantus was archon.* And I am

[g] Schol. Arist. p. 364. [*Schol. to ed. Bekk.* p. 182.—D.]
[h] Tzetz. Chil. viii. 156. [p. 278. *ed. Kiess.*—D.]
[i] Schol. Arist. p. 318. [*Schol. to ed. Bekk.* p. 149.—D.]
[j] Athen. p. 635. [V. 308. *ed. Schw.*—D.] *Φρυν. ἐν Φοινίσσαις.*
[k] *Ἐκ τῶν Φοινισσῶν Φρυνίχου τοὺς Πέρσας παραπεποιῆσθαι.*
[l] *Τὴν τοῦ Ξέρξου ἧττων.*
[m] Plut. in Themist. *Χορηγῶν τραγῳδοῖς.*

apt to believe that *Phœnissæ* was this very play which he made for Themistocles. For what could be a more proper subject and compliment to Themistocles than Xerxes's defeat, which he had so great a hand in? Now, we are sure, from the name of the archon, that this was done at Olymp. LXXV. 4.; and how long the poet survived this victory, there is nobody now to tell us.

To compare this now with Mr. B.'s doctrine about the age of Thespis and Phrynichus: *'Tis not to be doubted,* says he, *but the* Alcestis *of Phrynichus was acted before Olymp.* LXVII. (p. 168.) There spoke an oracle: *'tis not to be doubted,* because we find him still making tragedies XXXVI. years after. Mr. B. declares *his opinion* twice, *that a play acted about Olymp.* LX. *was not made by Thespis, but by Phrynichus* (p. 168, 169). Who will not rise up now to this gentleman's *opinion?* That play must needs be Phrynichus's, because he was working for the stage still, nay, and carried the prize there, LXIII. years after that Olympiad. This, I think, is a little longer than Mr. Dryden's vein has yet lasted, which, Mr. B. says, *is about* XXXVI. *years* (p. 169). But I can help him to another instance, that will come up with it exactly to a single year. For Sophocles[n] begun tragedy at the age of XXVIII., and held out at it till the age of XCI.;* the interval LXIII. If this example will bring off Mr. B. for saying the play is Phrynichus's, against the plain authority of the Marble, it is at his service; but with this reserve, that he shall not abuse me for *lending* it, for I have had too much of that already.

But, if I may venture to guess any thing that Mr. B. will think or say, I conceive that, upon better consideration, he will be willing to allow Suidas's words, *that Phrynichus got the prize at Olymp.* LXVII.,[o] to be meant of his *first* victory. For so we find in the Marble, that the *first* victories of

[* But see Clinton's *Fasti Hellen. from* LV. *to* CXXIV. *Ol.* p. 23 and 83. *sec. ed.*—D.]

[n] Marm. Arund.

[o] Suid. in *Φρυν.* Ἐνίκα ἐπὶ τῆς ξζ' Ὀλυμπιάδος.

Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, are the only ones recorded.[p] And if Phrynichus began at Olymp. LXVII., then the distance between his first and his last (that we know of) will be XXXVI. years, which is the very space that Mr. B. assigns to Aristophanes and Mr. Dryden. And it hits too with what the same Suidas has delivered about Thespis, *that he exhibited a play at Olymp.* LXI.[q] For if we interpret this passage, like the other about Phrynichus, that it was Thespis's *first* play, then the master will be older than the scholar by about XXV. years; which is a competent time, and, I believe, near upon the same that the very learned person* whom Mr. B. so much honours by *letting the world know he had all his knowledge in these matters from him* (p. 60), (which they that know that person's eminent learning will think to be no compliment to him), is older than Mr. B. And I humbly conceive, that all these hits and coincidences, when added to the express authority of the Marble, which sets Thespis after Olymp. LIX., will bring it up to the highest probability, that Thespis first introduced tragedy about Olymp. LXI.; which is XIV. years after the true Phalaris was dead.

I observe Mr. B.'s emphatical expression, *the* Alcestis *of Phrynichus, that Phrynichus who was Thespis's scholar* (p. 168): which seems to imply that he thought there were two Phrynichuses, both tragic poets: and, indeed, the famous Lilius Gyraldus,[r] almost as learned a man as Mr. B., was of the same opinion. It's necessary, therefore, to examine this point, or else our argument from the date of Phrynichus's *Phœnissæ* will be very lame and precarious; for it may be pretended, the author of *Phœnissæ* was not *that Phrynichus that was Thespis's scholar*. Now, with Mr. B.'s gracious permission, (for I dare be free with Gyraldus,) I will endeavour to shew that there was but one tragedian of that name.

[p] Marm. Arund. Πρῶτον ἐνίκησε.

[q] Suid. in Θεσπ.

[* "The worthy Dean of York" (Boyle's *Exam.* p. 59.), *i. e.* Dr. Galc.—D.]

[r] Gyrald. de Poëtis.

'Tis true, there were two Phrynichuses that wrote for the stage; the one a tragic, the other a comic poet; that's a thing beyond question: but the point that I contend for, is, that there were not two Phrynichuses writers of tragedy.

The pretence for asserting two tragic poets of that name is a passage of Suidas, who, after he had named *Φρύνιχος*, &c. *Phrynichus, the son of Polyphradmon, or Minyras, or Chorocles, the scholar of Thespis;* and *that his tragedies are nine, Πλευρωνία,*[s] *Αἰγύπτιοι, &c.* subjoins, under a new head, *Φρύνιχος, &c. Phrynichus, the son of Melanthas, an Athenian tragedian: some of his plays are Ἀνδρομέδα, Ἠριγόνη, and Πυῤῥίχαι.* This latter place is taken word for word out of Aristophanes's Scholiast,[t] who adds, that the same man made the tragedy called *The taking of Miletus.* Now, it may seem from these two passages, that there were two Phrynichuses tragic poets; for the one is called the son of Melanthas, the other not; and the three plays ascribed to the latter are quite different from all the nine that were made by the former. But, to take off this pretence, I crave leave to observe, that the naming his father Melanthas is an argument of small force; for we see the other has three fathers assigned to him, so uncertain was the tradition about the name of his father: some authors therefore might relate, that his father was called Melanthas; and yet mean the very same Phrynichus that according to others was the son of Polyphradmon. And then the second plea, that the plays attributed to the one are wholly different from those of the other, is even weaker than the former; for the whole dozen mentioned in Suidas might belong to the same Phrynichus. He says indeed, Phrynichus, Polyphradmon's son, *writ nine plays,* because the author he here copies from knew of no more. But there might be more, notwithstanding his not hearing of them, as we see there were really two, *The taking of Miletus,* and *Phœnissæ,* that are not mentioned here by Suidas.

[s] Suid. in *Φρυν.* leg. *Πλευρωνίαι,* ex Tzetze ad Lycophronem.

[t] Σχολ. Arist. Vesp. p. 364. [*Schol. to ed. Bekk.* p. 182.—D.]

Having shewn now what very slight ground the tradition about two tragedian Phrynichuses is built on, I will give some arguments on my side, which induce me to think there was but one. And my first is, because all the authors named above, Herodotus, Callisthenes, Strabo, Plutarch, Ælian, Libanius, Amm. Marcellinus, Joh. Tzetzes, who speak of the play called *The taking of Miletus*, style the author of it barely *Φρύνιχος ὁ τραγικὸς*, *Phrynichus the tragedian*, without adding *ὁ νεώτερος*, *the younger*, as all of them, or some at least, would and ought to have done, if this person had not been the famous Phrynichus that was Thespis's scholar. And so, when he is quoted on other occasions by Athenæus, Hephæstion, Isaac Tzetzes, &c., he is called in like manner *Phrynichus the tragic poet*, without the least intimation that there was another of the same name and profession.

Besides this, the very Scholiast on Aristophanes, and Suidas, who are the sole authors produced to shew there were two tragedians, do in other places plainly declare there was but one. *There were four Phrynichuses in all*, says the Scholiast;[u]

1. *Phrynichus, the son of Polyphradmon, the tragic poet.*
2. *Phrynichus, the son of Chorocles, an actor of tragedies.*[v]
3. *Phrynichus, the son of Eunomides, the comic poet.*
4. *Phrynichus, the Athenian general, who was concerned with Astyochus, and engaged in a plot against the government.*

What can be more evident than that, according to this catalogue, there was but one of this name a tragedian? But 'tis no wonder, if in Lexicons and Scholia compiled out of several authors there be several things inconsistent with one

[u] Schol. Arist. p. 397, 130. [*Schol. to ed. Bekk.* p. 247, 364.—D.] And so Suidas in *Φρυν.* and *Λύκις*.

[v] See also p. 113, 358. [*Schol. to ed. Bekk.* p. 133, 178.—D.] *Τραγικὸς ὑποκριτής.*

another. So, in another place, both the Scholiast[w] and Suidas[x] make this fourth Phrynichus the general to be the same with the third, the comic poet: on the contrary, Ælian[y] makes him the same with the first, and he adds a particular circumstance, *that in his tragedy Πυῤῥίχαι he so pleased the theatre with the warlike songs and dances of his chorus, that they chose him as a fit person to make a general.* Among the moderns some fall in with Ælian's story, and some with the other; but, with all deference to their judgments, I am persuaded both of them are false. For Phrynichus the general was stabbed at Athens, Olymp. XCII. 2., as Thucydides[z] relates: but a more exact account of the circumstances of his death is to be met with in Lysias[a] and Lycurgus[b] the orators. This being a matter of fact beyond all doubt and controversy, I affirm that the date of his death can neither agree with the tragic nor the comic poet's history, being too late for the one, and too early for the other. 'Tis too late for the tragedian, because he began to make plays, as we have seen above, at Olymp. LXVII.; from which time till Olymp. XCII. 2. there are CII. years: and even from the date of his *Phœnissæ*, that were acted at Olymp. LXXV. 4., which is the last time we hear of him, there are LXVI. years to the death of Phrynichus the general. And then it's too early for the comedian; for we find him alive V. years after, contending with his play[c] called *The Muses* (quoted by Athenæus, Pollux, Suidas, &c.) against Aristophanes's *Frogs*, at Olymp. XCIII. 3.; when Callias was archon.

Again; I will shew there was but one Phrynichus a tragedian. Aristophanes in his *Vespæ* says that the old men at Athens used to sing the *old songs of Phrynichus*;[d]

[w] Schol. p. 157. [*Schol. to ed. Bekk.* p. 385.—D.]
[x] Suid. in Φρυν. and Παλαίσμασι.
[y] Æl. Var. Hist. iii. 8.
[z] Thucyd. viii. p. 617.
[a] Lysias contra Agoratum, p. 136.
[b] Lycurg. contra Leocratem, p. 163, 164.
[c] Argum. Ran. Arist.
[d] Arist. Vesp. p. 318. [v. 219. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

——καὶ μινυρίζοντες μέλη
Ἀρχαιομελησιδωνοφρυνιχήρατα.

'Tis a conceited word of the poet's making, and σιδωνο, which is one member in the composition of it, relates to the *Phœnissæ* (*i. e.* the Sidonians), a play of Phrynichus's, as the Scholiast well observes. Here we see the author of *Phœnissæ* (whom they suppose to be the latter Phrynichus) is meant by Aristophanes; but if I prove too, that Aristophanes in this very place meant the Phrynichus Thespis's scholar, 'twill be evident that these two Phrynichuses (whom they falsely imagine) are really one and the same. Now, that Aristophanes meant the scholar of Thespis will appear from the very words μέλη ἀρχαῖα, *ancient songs and tunes. Ancient*, because that Phrynichus was the second, or, as some in Plato thought, the first author of tragedy: and *songs and tunes*, because he was celebrated and famous by that very character. *Phrynichus*, says the Scholiast on this place,[e] *had a mighty name for making of songs:* but in another place he says the same thing of Phrynichus the son of Polyphradmon, who, according to Suidas, was Thespis's scholar: *He was admired*, says he, *for the making of songs;*[f] *they cry him up for the composing of tunes; and he was before Æschylus.*[g] And can it be doubted, then, any longer, but that the same person is meant? 'Tis a problem of Aristotle's, Διὰ τὶ οἱ περὶ Φρύνιχον μᾶλλον ἦσαν μελοποιοί; *Why did Phrynichus make more songs than any tragedian does now-a-days?*[h] And he answers it, Ἢ διὰ τὸ πολλαπλάσια εἶναι τοτε τὰ μέλη ἐν ταῖς τῶν μέτρων τραγῳδίαις; correct it, τὰ μέλη τῶν μέτρων ἐν ταῖς τραγῳδίαις. *Was it*, says he, *because at that time the songs* (sung by the chorus)

[e] P. 318. [*Schol. to ed. Bekk.* p. 149.—D.] Δι' ὀνόματος ἦν καθόλου ἐπὶ μελοποιΐᾳ.

[f] P. 397. [*Schol. ibid.* p. 247.—D.] Ἐθαυμάζετο ἐπὶ μελοποιΐαις.

[g] P. 166. [*Schol. ibid.* p. 391.—D.] Ἐπαινοῦσιν εἰς [τὴν] μελ. . . . . ἦν δὲ πρὸ Αἰσχύλου.

[h] Arist. Probl. xix. 13.

in tragedies were many more than the verses (spoken by the actors)? Does not Aristotle's very question imply that there was but one Phrynichus a tragedian?

I will add one argument more for it, and that, if I do not much mistake, will put an end to the controversy. For I will prove, that the very passage in Aristophanes, where the Scholiast, and Suidas from him, tell us of this (supposed second) Phrynichus the son of Melanthas, concerns the one and true Phrynichus the scholar of Thespis. *The ancient poets*, says Athenæus,[i] *Thespis, Pratinas, Carcinus, and Phrynichus, were called* ὀρχηστικοὶ, *dancers; because they not only used much dancing in the choruses of their plays, but they were common dancing-masters, teaching any body that had a mind to learn.* And to the same purpose Aristotle[j] tells us, *that the first poetry of the stage was* ὀρχηστικωτέρα, *more set upon dances than that of the following ages.* This being premised, (though I had occasion to speak of it before,) I shall now set down the words of the poet;[k]

> Ὁ γὰρ γέρων, ὡς ἔπιε διὰ πολλοῦ χρόνου,
> Ἤκουσέ τ' αὐλοῦ, περιχαρὴς τῷ πράγματι,
> Ὀρχούμενος τῆς νυκτὸς οὐδὲν παύσεται·
> Τἀρχαῖ' ἐκεῖν' οἷς Θέσπις ἠγωνίζετο
> Καὶ τοὺς τραγῳδούς φησιν ἀποδείξειν κρόνους
> Τὸν νοῦν, διορχησόμενος ὀλίγον ὕστερον.

Which are spoken by a servant concerning an old fellow, his master, that was in a frolic of dancing. Who the Thespis was that is here spoken of, the Scholiast and Suidas pretend to tell us; for they say, *'twas one Thespis a harper, not the tragic poet.*[l] To speak freely, the place has not been understood this thousand years and more, being neither written nor pointed right. For what can be the meaning of κρόνους

[i] Athen. i. p. 22. [= I. 81. *ed. Schw.*—D.] Οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ποιηταί.

[j] Arist. Poët. iv. [= x. *ed. Tyrw.*—D]

[k] Arist. Vesp. p. 364. [= v. 1476. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

[l] Schol. ibid. [*Schol. to ed. Bekk.* p. 181.—D.] Ὁ κιθαρῳδὸς, οὐ γὰρ δὴ ὁ τραγικὸς. So Suidas in Θεσπ.

τὸν νοῦν? The word κρόνος alone signifies the whole; and τὸν νοῦν is superfluous and needless. So, in another place;[m]

Οὐχὶ διδάξεις τοῦτον, κρόνος ὤν.

I humbly conceive the whole passage should be thus read and distinguished;

Ὀρχούμενος τῆς νυκτὸς οὐδὲν παύεται
Τἀρχαῖ' ἐκεῖν', οἷς Θέσπις ἠγωνίζετο·
Καὶ τοὺς τραγῳδούς φησιν ἀποδείξειν κρόνους
Τοὺς νῦν, διορχησόμενος ὀλίγον ὕστερον.

All night long, says he, *he dances those old dances that Thespis used in his choruses: and he says he'll dance here upon the stage by and by, and shew the tragedians of these times to be a parcel of fools, he'll out-dance them so much.* And who can doubt now, that considers what I have newly quoted from Athenæus, but that Thespis ὁ ἀρχαῖος, the *old* tragic poet (who lived CXIV. years before the date of this play), ὁ ὀρχηστικὸς, the common *dancing-master* at Athens, is meant here by Aristophanes? So that the Scholiast and Suidas may take their *harper* again for their own diversion; for it was a common practice among those grammarians, when they happened to be at a loss, to invent a story for the purpose. But to go on with Aristophanes: the old fellow begins to dance, and as he dances, he says;*

Κλῇθρα χαλάσθω τάδε· καὶ γὰρ δὴ
Σχήματος ἀρχὴ
(Οἰ. Μᾶλλον δέ γ' ἴσως μανίας ἀρχή)
Πλευρὰν λυγίσαντος ὑπαὶ ῥώμης.

So the interlocution is to be placed here, which is faulty in all the editions. *Make room there,* says he, *for I'm beginning a dance that's enough to strain a man's side with the violent motion.* After a line or two, he adds;

[m] Arist. Nub. p. 107. [v. 919. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

[* *Vesp.* v. 1484. *ed. Bekk.*, where in the first line καὶ δὴ γὰρ, and in the last ὑπὸ ῥώμης.—D.]

Πτήσσει Φρύνιχος, ὥσπερ ἀλέκτωρ,*
(Οἰ. Τάχα βαλλήσεις)
Σκέλος οὐράνιόν γ' ἐκλακτίζων.

Thus the words are to be pointed, which have hitherto been falsely distinguished. But there's an error here of a worse sort, which has possessed the copies of this play ever since Adrian's time, and perhaps before. *Πτήσσω* signifies *to crouch and sneak away for fear*, as poultry do at the sight of the kite, or a cock when he is beaten at fighting. The Scholiast[n] and Ælian[o] tell† us, that *πτήσσει Φρύνιχος, ὥσπερ ἀλέκτωρ, Phrynichus sneaks like a cock*, became a proverb upon those *that came off badly in any affair;* because Phrynichus the tragedian came off sneakingly when he was fined 1000 drachms for his play, *Μιλήτου ἅλωσις*. Now, with due reverence to antiquity, I crave leave to suspect that this is a proverb coined on purpose, because the commentators were puzzled here. For, in the first place, *to sneak away like a cock*, seems to be a very improper similitude; for a cock is one of the most bold and martial of birds. I know there's an expression like this, of some nameless poet's;

Ἔπτηξ', ἀλέκτωρ δοῦλον ὡς κλίνας πτερόν,

He sneaked like a cock, that hangs down his wings when he's beaten.[p]

But this case is widely different; for the comparison here is very elegant and natural, because the circumstance of *being beaten* is added to it: but to say it in general of a cock, as if the whole species were naturally timid, is unwarrantable and absurd. As in another instance; *he stares like a man frightened out of his wits*, is an expression proper enough: but we cannot say in general, *he stares like a man*. I shall

[* All eds. of Aristoph. *ὥς τις*.—D.]
[n] Schol. ibid. [*Schol. to ed. Bekk.* p. 182.—D.]
[o] Ælian. Var. Hist. xiii. 17. *Ἐπὶ τῶν κακόν τι πασχόντων*. [Eds. *κακῶς*.—D.]
[† Old ed. "*tells*."—D.]
[p] Plut. in Alcib.

hardly believe, therefore, that Aristophanes, the most ingenious man of an age that was fertile of great wits, would let such an expression pass him, *he sneaks like a cock.* But, in the next place, the absurdity of it is doubled and tripled by the sentence that it's joined with: *Phrynichus*, says he, *kicking his legs up to the very heavens in his dances, crouches and sneaks like a cock.* This is no better than downright nonsense; though, to say something in excuse for the interpreters, they did not join ἐκλακτίζων with Φρύνιχος, as I do, but with the word that follows in the next verse. But, if the reader pleases to consult the passage in the poet, he will be convinced that the construction can be no other than what I have made it. Ἐκλακτισμὸς, says Hesychius, σχῆμα χορικὸν, ὀρχήσεως σύντονον, (correct it, σχῆμα χορικῆς ὀρχήσεως, σύντονον,[q]) *was a sort of dance lofty and vehement, used by the choruses.* And Julius Pollux, Τὰ ἐκλακτίσματα, γυναικῶν ἦν ὀρχήματα· ἔδει γὰρ ὑπὲρ τὸν ὦμον ἐκλακτίσαι; *the* ἐκλακτίσματα, says he, *were the dances of women; for they were to kick their heels higher than their shoulders.*[r] But I conceive here's a palpable fault in this passage of Pollux; for certainly this kind of dance would be very unseemly and immodest in *women.* And the particle γὰρ, *for*, does further shew the reading to be faulty. For how can the throwing up the heels as high as the head in dancing, be assigned as a *reason* why the dance must belong to women? It would rather prove it belonged to men, because it required great strength and agility. But the error will be removed, if instead of γυναικῶν we correct it γυμνικῶν. The dance, says he, was proper to the γυμνικοὶ, *exercisers; for* the legs were to be thrown up very high, and consequently it required *teaching* and *practice.* Well, it's evident now, how every way absurd and improper the present passage of Aristophanes is. If I may have leave to offer at the emendation of so inveterate an error, I would read the place thus;

[q] So Pollux, iv. 14. Τὸ σχίσταις ἕλκειν, σχῆμα ὀρχήσεως χορικῆς.

[r] Pollux, ibid.

ΠΛΗΣΣΕΙ Φρύνιχος, ὥσπερ ἀλέκτωρ*
(Οἰ. Τάχα βαλλήσεις)
Σκέλος οὐράνιόν γ' ἐκλακτίζων.

i. e. *Phrynichus* STRIKES *like a cock, throwing up his heels very lofty.* This is spoken by the old fellow while he's cutting his capers; and in one of his frisks he offers to *strike* the servant that stood by with his foot as it was aloft. Upon which the servant says, *Τάχα βαλλήσεις, You'll hit me by and by with your capering and kicking. Πλήσσω* is the proper term for a cock when he strikes as he's fighting; as *πλῆκτρον* is his *spur* that he strikes with. The meaning of the passage is this; that in his dances he leaped up and vaulted like Phrynichus, who was celebrated for those performances: as it further appears from what follows a little after;

Καὶ τὸ Φρυνίχειον
Εκλακτισάτω τις ὅπως
Ἀδοντες ἄνω σκέλος
Ὠζωσιν οἱ θεαταί.[3]

Which ought to be thus corrected and distinguished;

Καὶ, τὸ Φρυνίχειον,
Ἐκλακτισάτω τις· ὅπως
Ἰδόντες ἄνω σκέλος,
Ὠζωσιν οἱ θεαταί.

i. e. *And, in Phrynichus's way, frisk and caper; so as the spectators, seeing your legs aloft, may cry out with admiration.* Now, to draw our inference from these several passages, it appears, I suppose, sufficiently, that the Phry-

[* "Quam emendationem [πλήσσει] certissimam judicans Porsonus, hunc "locum citabat ut exemplum mendi inveterati; siquidem jam Æliani tempore "irrepserat πτήσσει." PORSONI *Notæ in Aristoph., ed. Dobree,* p. 146.—Bekker, however, follows the old reading; and what may be advanced in defence of it, will be found in the notes to his ed. of Aristoph.—D.]

[3] Arist. p. 365. [v. 1524. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

nichus here spoken of by Aristophanes was, as well as the Thespis, famous for his dancing, and consequently, by the authority of Athenæus quoted above, he must be ὁ ἀρχαῖος Φρύνιχος, *the ancient Phrynichus*, ὁ ὀρχηστικὸς, *the master of dancing*.[t] Upon the whole matter, then, there was but one tragedian Phrynichus, the scholar of Thespis; and if so, we have fully proved already, from the dates of his plays, that his master Thespis ought not to be placed earlier than about Olymp. LXI.

But I have one short argument more, independent of all those before, which will evidently prove that Thespis was younger than Phalaris. For, to take the earliest account of Thespis, which Mr. Boyle contends for, he was contemporary with Pisistratus. But Pisistratus's eldest son Hippias was alive at Olymp. LXXI. 2.;[u] and after that was at the battle at Marathon, Olymp. LXXII. 2., where he was slain, according to Cicero,[v] Justin,[w] and Tertullian;[x] but, if Suidas say true (out of Ælian's book *De Providentiâ*, as one may guess by the style and matter), he survived that fight,[y] and died at Lemnos of a lingering distemper: and this latter account seems to be confirmed by Thucydides and Herodotus; for the one says, *he was with the Medes at Marathon*,[z] without saying he was killed there; and the other not obscurely intimates that he was not killed; for he says, *his tooth, that dropped out of his head upon the Attic ground, was the only part of his body that had a share in that soil*.[a] There are only two generations, then, from Thespis's time to the battle of Marathon: but there are four from Phalaris's; for Theron, the fourth from that Telemachus that deposed Pha-

[t] We have part of an epigram made by Phrynichus himself (Plut. Sympos. viii. Quæst. 9.) in commendation of his own dancing:

Σχήματα δ' ὄρχησις τόσα μοι πόρεν, ὅσσ' ἐνὶ πόντῳ
Κύματα ποιεῖται χείματι νὺξ ὀλοή.

[u] Marm. Arund.
[v] Cic. ad Att. ix. 10.
[w] Just. ii. 9.
[x] Tert. adv. Gentes.
[y] Suid. in Ἱππίας.
[z] Thuc. vi. p. 452.
[a] Herod. vi. 106.

laris,[b] got the government of Agrigentum Olymp. LXXIII. 1., but three years only after that battle; and he was then at least about XL. years old, as appears from the ages of his son and daughter. I'll give a table of both the lines of succession;

		1. *Telemachus.*	Phalaris.
		2. *Emmenides.*	
Thespis.	1. *Pisistratus.*	3. *Ænesidamus.*	
	2. *Hippias, Ol.* LXXII. 2.	4. *Theron, Ol.* LXXII. 2.	

'Tis true, Hippias was an old man at that time; though it appears, by the post and business that Herodotus assigns him, that he was not so very old as some make him. But, however, let him be as old, if they please, as Theron's father; yet still the case is very apparent, that Thespis is one whole generation younger than Phalaris.

It may now be a fit season to visit the learned Examiner, and to see with what vigour and address he repels all these arguments, that have settled the time of Thespis about Olymp. LXI. His authorities are Diogenes Laërtius and Plutarch (p. 166.), who shall now be examined. The point which Mr. B. endeavours to prove is this; that Thespis acted plays in Solon's time, and consequently before the death of Phalaris. Now, the words of Laërtius, which are all, he says, that any ways relate to this affair, are exactly these. *Solon,* says he, *hindered Thespis from acting of tragedies, believing those false representations to be of no use.*[c] Hence the Examiner infers that Thespis acted his plays in the days of Solon; so that his argument lies thus: *He was hindered from acting tragedies; ergò, he acted tragedies; i. e.* he acted them, because he did not act them. Is not this now a syllogism worthy of the acute Mr. B. and his new System of Logic? And is it not a much better argument, if you turn its face the quite contrary way? For if Solon,

[b] See above, p. 103, 104, 105.

[c] Laërt. Solone. *Θέσπιν ἐκώλυσε τραγῳδίας ἄγειν τε καὶ διδάσκειν, ὡς ἀνωφελῆ τὴν ψευδολογίαν.*

when Thespis, as we may suppose, made application to him for his leave to act tragedies, would not suffer him to do it; is it not reasonable to infer that Thespis acted none, till after Solon's death? which is the very account that I have established by so many arguments.

But, are not the words of Plutarch more clear and express in the Examiner's behalf? 'Tis true: for this author relates particularly, *that Solon saw one of Thespis's plays, and then, disliking the way of it, he forbad him to act any more.*[d] But what then? how does it appear that this was done before Phalaris's death? If I should allow this story in Plutarch to be true, yet Mr. B. will find it a difficult thing to extort from it what he aims at. *Why, yes,* he says, *Solon was archon Olymp.* XLVI. 3., *which is* XLIV. *years before Phalaris was killed* (p. 166). Here Mr. B. supposes that this business with Thespis happened in the year of Solon's archonship; which is directly to oppose his own author Plutarch, who relates at large, how Solon, after he was archon, travelled abroad x. years; and after his return (how long after we cannot tell), this thing passed between him and Thespis. *But Eusebius,* says Mr. B., *places the rise of tragedy Olymp.* XLII. 2.,* *a little after Solon's archonship* (p. 166). Will Mr. B. here stand to this, against the plain words of Plutarch? Mr. B. either does or may know, that Eusebius's histories are so shuffled and interpolated, and so disjointed from his tables, that no wise chronologer dares depend on them in a point of any niceness, without concurrent authority. *But,* says he, *take the lowest account that can be, that Solon saw Thespis's plays at the latter end of his life; Solon died at the end of the* LIII.,[e] *or the beginning of the* LIVth *Olympiad, i. e.* XIV. *years before Phalaris died* (p. 167). Now, here's a double misrepresentation of the author he pretends to quote. For there's nothing in

[d] Plut. Solone.

[* "Eusebius's *Chronicon* . . . . placing the rise of tragedy at the 47th Olym-"piad." Boyle's *Exam.* p. 166. of the first three eds. — Concerning Solon, see Clinton's *Fasti Hellen. from* LV. *to* CXXIV. *Ol.* (*Appen.*) p. 298, &c. *sec. ed.*—D.]

[e] Plut. Solone.

Plutarch about Olymp. LIII. or LIV. He only tells us, that one Phanias said, Solon died when Hegestratus was archon, who succeeded Comias, in whose year Pisistratus usurped the government. But we know the date of Pisistratus's usurpation is Olymp. LIV. 4., Comias being then archon.[f] So that Solon, according to Phanias's doctrine, died at Olymp. LV. 1., which is IV. years later than Mr. B. makes him say. But, to pardon him this fault, which in him shall pass for a small one, yet the next will bear harder upon him; for he brings in this date of Solon's death out of Phanias, as if it was a point uncontroverted, and allowed by Plutarch himself. Whereas* Plutarch barely mentions it, without the least token of approbation, and places before it a quite different account from Heraclides (an author as old as Phanias, and much more considerable), *that Solon lived ΣΥΧΝΟΝ ΧΡΟΝΟΝ, a* LONG TIME *after Pisistratus's usurpation.* Nay, there's some ground for conjecture that Plutarch disbelieved Phanias; for he espouses that common story about Solon's conversation with Crœsus,[g] who came not to the crown till Olymp. LV. 3., which is two years after Solon's death, according to Phanias; and yet Solon did not see Crœsus at his first accession to the throne, but after he had conquered XIV. nations in Asia, as Herodotus tells it. So that, for any thing that Mr. B. has proved, Solon might possibly have this controversy with Thespis after the death of the *Sicilian prince.* But what if it was before his death? Must the fame of this new diversion called *tragedy,* which was then a dishonourable thing, and quashed by the magistrate, needs fly as far as Sicily, to the *prince's* court? As if a new show could not be produced at a Bartholomew fair, but the foreign princes must all hear of it.

But I must frankly observe, on Mr. B.'s side (what he forgot to do for himself), that, as Plutarch tells this story of Thespis, it must have happened a little before Pisistratus's tyranny. For he presently subjoins, that when Pisistratus

[f] Marm. Arund. Κ . . . ΟΥ ΑΡΧΟΝΤΟΣ.

[* Old ed. "*Whenas.*"—D.]

[g] Plut. Solone.

had wounded himself, and, pretending that he was set upon by enemies, desired to have a guard; *You do not act*, says Solon to him, *the part of Ulysses well; for he wounded himself to deceive his enemies, but you to deceive your own countrymen.* Laërtius tells it a little plainer; that when Pisistratus had wounded himself, Solon said, *Ay, this comes of Thespis's acting and personating in his tragedies.*[h] Take both these passages together, and it must be allowed, that, as far as Plutarch's credit goes, it appears that Thespis did act some of his plays before Olymp. LIV. 4. But we have seen above, that the Arundel Marble and Suidas set the date of his first essay about Olymp. LXI. And the age of Phrynichus his scholar strongly favours their side; for, by their reckoning he began his plays about XXV. years after his master; but by Plutarch's, above L. And whose authority now shall we follow? Though there's odds enough against Plutarch, from the antiquity of the author of the Marble, who was above 300 years older than he, and from his particular diligence and exactness about the history of the stage; yet I'll make bold to add another reason or two, why I cannot here follow him. For he himself tells me, in another place, *that the first that brought μύθους καὶ πάθη, the stories and the calamities of heroes, upon the stage were Phrynichus and Æschylus:*[i] so that before them all tragedy was satyrical, and the subject of it was nothing else but Bacchus and his Satyrs. But if this affair about Thespis, and Solon, and Pisistratus, be true, then Thespis must have represented Ulysses and other heroes in his plays; for it's intimated that Thespis's acting gave the hint to Pisistratus to wound himself, as Ulysses did. So that this latter passage of Plutarch is a refutation of his former. The case seems to me to be this. Somebody had invented and published this about Solon, as a thing very agreeable to the character of a wise lawgiver; and Plutarch, who would never balk a

[h] Laërt. Solone. Ἐκεῖθεν ταῦτα φῦναι.

[i] Plut. Symp. I. Quæst. i.

good story, though it did not exactly hit with chronology, thought it a fault to omit it in his history of Solon's Life. We have another instance of this in the very same treatise; for he tells at large the conversation that Solon had with Crœsus;[j] though he prefaces it with this, *that some would shew, by chronological arguments, that it must needs be a fiction.* Nay, he is so far transported in behalf of his story, that he accuses the whole system of chronology, as a labyrinth of endless uncertainty.[k] And yet he himself upon other occasions can make use of chronological arguments, when he thinks they conduce to his design. As in the Life of Themistocles, he falls foul upon Stesimbrotus (an author, as he himself owns,[l] contemporary with Pericles and Cimon; who, as Athenæus says,[m] had seen Pericles, and might possibly see Themistocles too), for affirming that Themistocles conversed with Anaxagoras and Melissus, the philosophers: *wherein he did not consider chronology,*[n] says Plutarch; *for Anaxagoras was an acquaintance of Pericles, who was much younger than Themistocles; and Melissus was general against Pericles in the Samian war.* Here, we see, this great man could believe that an argument drawn from time is of considerable force; and yet, with humble submission, chronology seems to be revenged on him in this place for the slight he put upon't in the other. For Pericles was not so remote from Themistocles's time, but that one and the same person might be acquainted with them both, and even they themselves be acquainted with one another; the one being made general within XVI. years after the other's banishment.[o] And first for Anaxagoras: he might very well be personally known to Themistocles; for he was born at Olymp. LXX. 1., as Apollodorus and Demetrius Phalereus, two excellent writers, testify;[p] and began to teach philo-

[j] Plut. in Solone.

[k] Id. Χρονικοῖς τισι λεγομένοις κανόσιν, &c.

[l] Plut. in Cimone. [m] Athen. p. 589. [=V. 131. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

[n] Plut. in Themist. Οὐκ εὖ τῶν χρόνων ἁπτόμενος.

[o] Diod. p. 41 and 47. [p] Laërt. in Anaxag.

sophy in Athens at XX. years of age, Olymp. LXXV. 1., when Callias was archon; the very year of Xerxes's Expedition, when Themistocles acquired such glory; and IX. years before he was banished. The same authors inform us, that Anaxagoras continued XXX. years teaching at Athens; so that he had IX. entire years to cultivate a friendship with Themistocles. And in the second place, what hinders but that Melissus too might be Themistocles's friend, and yet be the Samian general in the war against Pericles, which was at Olymp. LXXXIV. 4.?[q] For, suppose him to have been of the same age with Anaxagoras, he might then, as we have seen already, have been acquainted with Themistocles: nay, suppose him, if you please, X. years older, and yet he would be but LXX. years old when he was general to the Samians. And what is there extraordinary in that? Anaxagoras himself survived that war XIII. years:[r] and we have had in our own time more generals than one that were LXXX. years of age.

But Mr. B. will prove, *that I myself allow Plutarch's account of Thespis, and am obliged to defend it, as much as he is* (p. 166, 170.): because I owned, in another place, that he was *contemporary with Solon.*[s] The reader shall judge between us, when I have told him the case. Johannes Malalas and another writer relate, that, soon after the siege of Troy, in Orestes's time, one Themis or Theomis (*i. e.* as I corrected it, Thespis) first invented tragedies: in opposition to which, I affirmed that the true Thespis *lived in Solon's time*, long enough after the taking of Troy. Now certainly there was no need of exactness here, where the distance of the two ages spoken of was so many whole centuries. I had no need to determine Thespis's age to a particular year, but to say he lived in the time of Solon; as without question he did, and may be supposed about XX. years old before

[q] Thucyd., Diod., Suid. v. Μέλισσος, who confounds Melissus with Melitus the orator.

[r] Laërt. ibid.

[s] Dissert. ad Mal. p. 46. [*ed.* 1691.—D.] Soloni æqualis fuit.

Solon died, if he made tragedies at Olymp. LXI. Mr. B. is pleased to call that *Dissertation* my *soft* Epistle to Dr. Mill (p. 166.); which is ironically said for *hard:* and indeed, to confess the truth, it is too *hard* for him to bite at, as appears by his most miserable stuff about Anapæstic verses.[t]

And so much for the age of Thespis. I shall now consider the opinion of those that make tragedy to be older than he. And what has the learned Examiner produced to maintain this assertion? Nothing but two common and obvious passages of Plato and Laërtius (p. 170, 171, 172.), which every second-hand writer quotes that speaks but of the age of tragedy: one of which passages tells us, *that tragedy did not commence with Thespis nor Phrynichus, but was very old at Athens:*[u] the other, *that of old in tragedy the chorus alone performed the whole drama; afterwards Thespis introduced one actor.*[v] This is all he brings, except a hint out of Aristotle (p. 172.), who, affirming that Æschylus invented the second actor, *implies*, he says, that Thespis found out the first. Now, for two of his authorities, Laërtius and Aristotle, these words of theirs do not prove that tragedy is older than Thespis. For Thespis might be the first introducer of one actor, and yet be the inventor too of that sort of tragedy that was performed by the chorus alone.* At first, his plays might be but rude and imper-

[t] See above, p. 191, &c.

[u] Plato in Min. Πάνυ παλαιόν.

[v] Laërt. in Plat.

[* "Ac prima tragœdiæ forma, teste Aristotele § 15. ea fuit, quæ ab iis, qui "dithyrambum canebant, nata erat. Falluntur verò Bentleius in Diss. Phal. "p. 154. [ed. Lennep. 4to. = p. 324. of the present ed.] et Tyrwhittus, p. 131. "tragœdiam antiquitùs solo choro constitisse existimantes. Ac Tyrwhittus vix "aliud inter tragicum et dithyrambicum chorum discrimen fuisse putat, quàm "quòd dithyrambico præmium bos, tragico hircus daretur. Bentleius autem "Diogenis Laërtii auctoritate utitur iii. 56. Etiam Athenæus, p. 630. C., tra-"gicam et satyricam poësin antiquitùs è solis choris constitisse tradit. At Dio-"genes non de hymnis à choro cani solitis intelligi debet, sed de conatibus "extemporalibus, quos nondum institutis actoribus chorus ipse fundebat, prout "cuique eorum, è quibus constabat, in mentem veniret. Id clarè intelligitur è "Diogenis verbis: ὥσπερ δὲ τὸ παλαιὸν ἐν τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ πρότερον μὲν μόνος ὁ χορὸς "διεδραμάτιζεν, ὕστερον δὲ Θέσπις ἕνα ὑποκριτὴν ἐξεῦρεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ διαναπαύεσθαι

fect, some songs only and dances by the chorus and the hemichoria, *i. e.* the two halves of the chorus, answering to each other: afterwards, by long use and experience, perhaps of XX. or XXX. or XL. years, he might improve upon his own invention, and introduce one actor, to discourse while the chorus took breath. What inconsistency is there in this? Æschylus, we see, is generally reported as the inventor of the second actor: and yet several believed that afterwards he invented too the third actor;[w] for, in the making of LXXV. plays he had time enough to improve further upon his first model. Where, then, is Mr. B.'s consequence that he would draw from Laërtius and Aristotle? But he has Plato yet in reserve, who affirms, *that tragedy was in use at Athens long before Thespis's time.* I have already observed, in answer to this,* that Plato himself relates it as a paradox; and nobody that came after him would second him in't. He might be excused, indeed, by this distinction, that he meant *αὐτοσχεδιάσματα*, the *extemporal songs* in praise of Bacchus, which were really older than Thespis, and gave the first rise to tragedy; were it not that he affirms there, that Minos the king of Crete was introduced in those old tragedies before Thespis's time.[x] Which by no means may be allowed; for the old tragedy was all *σατυρικὴ καὶ ὀρχηστικὴ*, dancing and singing, and had no serious and doleful argument, as Minos must be, but all jollity and mirth.

Mr. B. here takes his usual freedom of giving my character; *he believes*, he says, *Laërtius's works are better known to me than Plato's* (p. 171). What authors he believes I am best acquainted with, is to me wholly indifferent; but, since he seems curious about my acquaintance with books, I'll tell him privately in his ear, that the last acquaintance I made

" *τὸν χορόν.* Illustrat hic locus Athenæi locum." HERMANNI *Com. ad Arist. Poët.* p. 107., where the reader will find other curious remarks on the *μεταβολαὶ* of tragedy. See also SCHNEIDER *de Orig. Trag. Gr.* p. 10. et sq.—D.]

[w] Vita Æsch. *Τὸν τρίτον ὑποκριτὴν αὐτὸς ἐξεῦρε.*

[* See p. 285. and note.—D.]

[x] Plat. in Minoe.

of this sort was with the worst author I ever yet met with. But surely one would think, now, that the Examiner himself was very well versed in Plato, since he's so pert upon me, and *believes* that I am not. Now, the reader shall see presently, and by this very passage of Plato, whether Mr. B. *knows* that author, or rather *casts his eye upon him* (p. 160.), as he did on Seneca and the Greek tragedians. The interlocutors in this dialogue are Socrates and one Minos an Athenian, his acquaintance; and the subject of half their discourse is, to vindicate Minos, the ancient king of Crete, from the character of cruelty and injustice, which the tragic poets by their plays had fastened upon him. Now, our Examiner, with his wonderful diligence and sense, believes the person that talks there with Socrates to be Minos the old king of Crete, who lived above DCCC. years before him. *Minos*, says he, *asks Socrates, how men come to have such an opinion of* HIS *severity?* (Edit. 3. last leaf), *i. e.* of Minos's own, that speaks, as plainly appears there from Mr. B.'s context. Is not this gentleman, now, very well qualified to pass censures upon writers? that can make Plato's discourses to be like Lucian's *Dialogues of the Dead!* Nay, that can put the dead and the live together in dialogue, and be almost like Mezentius (the Phalaris of his age, and therefore worthy of Mr. B.'s respect), who

*Mortua quinetiam jungebat corpora vivis!**

If he had read that short treatise of Plato's without being *fast asleep* (p. 137.), he might see some of those numerous places which will tell him that Minos, the interlocutor there, was not Minos of Crete. *Dost thou know*, says Socrates to him, *which of the Cretan kings were good men, as Minos and Rhadamanthys, the sons of Jove and Europa? Rhadamanthys*, replies the other, *was a good man, they say; but Minos was cruel, severe, and unjust. Have a care*, says Socrates again to him, *this borders upon blasphemy and impiety. But*

[* Virg. *Æn.* viii. 485.—D.]

I'll set you right in your opinion of Minos, lest you, who are a man, the son of a man, should offend against a hero, the son of Jove.* If these places be not sufficient to make the Examiner sensible of his blunder, I'll give him several others *when he and I next talk together.* And I'll tell him this further, beforehand, that, in my opinion, Plato himself published this dialogue without naming the interlocutor; it was only *Σωκράτης καὶ ὁ δεῖνα, Socrates and somebody.* Afterwards, Minos was made the name of that unknown person, from *Μίνως*, the title of the dialogue. But I hardly think that he that first did it, ever imagined such an ingenious author as Mr. B. could have been caught in so sorry a trap.

To convince us that tragedy was older than Thespis, Mr. B. assures us, *that Plutarch, in the Life of Theseus,* EXPRESSLY *tells us, that the acting of tragedies was one part of the funeral solemnities which the Athenians performed at the tomb of Theseus* (p. 176). But he has been told already by another that there's *no such thing in Plutarch's Life of Theseus; or if there was, yet tragedy would not on that account be older than Thespis, for Theseus had no tomb at Athens before the days of Thespis.*[z] Mr. B. has pleaded guilty to this, and confessed (p. ult. 3d Edit.) that he took it at second-hand from Jul. Scaliger, who says, *Tragœdiam esse rem antiquam constat ex historiâ; ad Thesei namque sepulchrum certâsse tragicos legimus.*[a] I'll tell him too of another that took it at the same hand, the learned Ger. Vossius; *Aiunt quidam,* says he, *Thesei ad sepulchrum certâsse tragicos, atque eam fuisse tragœdiarum vetustissimam.*[b] Well, I will not impute this to Mr. B. as a fault, since Scaliger and Vossius have erred before him; I'll only observe the difference between those great men and the greater Mr. B. They cite no authority for what they say, because they said it only at second-hand; Mr. B., who took it at trust from them,

[* Old ed. "*shouldst.*"—D.]

[z] View of Dissert. p. 72. [See note p. 264.—D.]

[a] Scal. de Poët. i. 5.

[b] Voss. Poët. ii. 12.

believing that they had it out of Plutarch's Life of Theseus, cites him for it *at a venture* in his margin, and in the text says he *expressly* tells us so. What poor and cowardly spirits were they, in comparison of Mr. B.! They wanted the manly and generous courage to quote authors they had never read, with an air of assurance. 'Tis a great blot upon their memories; but, however, we'll let it pass; and examine a little into the story of Theseus's tomb, because such great men have been mistaken in't. For, were it true that tragedies had been acted at Theseus's tomb, (which is not so,) yet those tragedies would be so far from being the first, that they came LX. years after Thespis had exhibited his. Theseus died in banishment, being murdered and privately buried in the isle of Scyros; and, about DCCC. years afterwards, the oracle enjoined the Athenians to take up his bones, and carry them to Athens; which was accordingly done by Cimon, Olymp. LXXVII. 4. *Μετὰ τὰ Μηδικὰ*, says Plutarch, *Φαίδωνος ἄρχοντος, after the Medes' invasion, when Phædon was archon, the oracle bid the Athenians fetch home the bones of Theseus, and it was done by Cimon.*[d] If the reading be not corrupted, this oracle was given Olymp. LXXVI. 1., for then Phædon was archon; and at this rate it will be seven years before the oracle was obeyed. But I rather believe, that for *Μηδικὰ Φαίδωνος*, we ought to correct it *Μηδικὰ Ἀφεψίωνος*,* *when Aphepsion was archon.* *Α* was lost in *Ἀφεψίωνος*, because *Μηδικὰ* ends with that letter; and *αι* and *ε* are commonly put one for the other, being anciently pronounced both alike. Now, *Ἀφεψίων* was archon Olymp. LXXVII. 4.,[e] which was the very year that

[d] Plut. in Theseo.

[* "There is no need of altering the text. The island was actually conquered in the year of Phædon. This we know from Thucydides, i. 98. and Diodorus, xi. 41, 48. combined. Plutarch named the archon Phædon with reference to the conquest of the island; and then, by a negligence not unusual in him, connected the oracle with that fact, as a contemporary transaction, although in truth the oracle was not procured till six or seven years afterwards." CLINTON's *Fasti Hellen. from* LV. *to* CXXIV. *Ol.* p. 34. *sec. ed.*—D.]

[e] Laërt. in Socrat.

Cimon fetched Theseus's bones, as Plutarch relates it; who adds too, that Ἀφεψίων was the archon.[f] Diodorus, in the Annal of that year, says Phæon was archon; for so the old reading is, ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησι Φαίωνος. The late editions substitute Φαίδωνος; but the true lection is Ἀφεψίωνος, as appears from Laërtius and Plutarch. And this depravation in Diodorus confirms my suspicion about the first passage in Plutarch; for, as here Ἀφεψίωνος was changed into Φαίωνος, so there it might be into Φαίδωνος. The Arundelian Marble calls him Apsephion, placing ἄρχοντος Ἀψηφίονος at this very year. Meursius,[g] from these faulty places in Plutarch and Laërtius, makes Phædon to have been thrice archon; about Ol. LXXIII. 3., at Ol. LXXVI. 1., and LXXVII. 4.; whereas really he was but once archon, at Ol. LXXVI. 1. But there's another mistake committed by Jos. Scaliger, that has had very odd consequences. Scaliger, in his Ὀλυμπιάδων ἀναγραφὴ, which he collected from all the notes of time that he could meet with in any authors, makes Ἀφεψίων to be archon at Olymp. LXXIV. 4. This, I am persuaded, he did not do out of design, but pure forgetfulness;[h] for he intended to have set it at Olymp. LXXVII. 4., but, in the interval between reading his author and committing this note to writing, his memory deceived him, and he put it at Olymp. LXXIV. 4. This suspicion of mine will be made out from Scaliger's own words there, Ὀλυμπ. οδ'. δ'. Ἀφεψίων. Σωκράτης ἐγεννήθη, κατά τινας; compared with Laërtius's, from whence they are taken, (Σωκράτης) ἐγεννήθη . . . ἐπὶ Ἀφεψίωνος ἐν τῷ δ' ἔτει τῆς οζ' Ὀλυμπιάδος.[i] After this comes Meursius, who mistakes that Ὀλυμπιάδων ἀναγραφὴ for an ancient piece first published out of MS. by Scaliger; and seeing Aphepsion named there as archon, Olymp. LXXIV. 4., he interpolates Laërtius, to make him agree with it:[j] by which means he

[f] Plut. Cim.

[g] Meurs. Archont. ii. 6, 7.

[h] See here, p. 215 and 264. [and note.—D.]

[i] Laërt. in Socr.

[j] Meurs. Arch. ii. 7.

makes two falsehoods in Laërtius's text, which was right before he meddled with it; for he sets Aphepsion at Olymp. LXXIV. 4. instead of LXXVII. 4., and at Olymp. LXXVII. 4. he puts Phædon instead of Aphepsion. And besides this, he dates Cimon's taking of Scyros, and the fetching of Theseus's bones, at Olymp. LXXIV. 4.,[k] because Plutarch says Aphepsion was archon at the time of that action;[l] which is a mistake of a dozen years, for this was done Olymp. LXXVII. 3. and 4., as is plain from Diodorus,[m] and intimated even by Plutarch himself. Nay, to see how error is propagated, even Petavius too was caught here; for, at Olymp. LXXVII. 4. he takes notice of Laërtius's inconsistency, as he thought it: *he makes Socrates to be born*, says he, *at this Olympiad; but he names Aphepsion for the archon, who was not in this year, but Olymp.* LXXIV. 4.[n] And again, at Olymp. LXXIV. 4. Petavius makes Aphepsion to be archon,[o] and cites Laërtius for it in the Life of Socrates; and he adds, *that in this year Cimon fetched Theseus's bones from Scyros to Athens.* Here, we see, are the very same mistakes that Meursius fell into; and the sole occasion of them all was the heedlessness of Jos. Scaliger.* But Petavius has yet another mischance; for he adds,[p] that *upon the bringing of Theseus's bones, the prizes for tragedians were instituted;* which is part of the error of Jul. Scaliger and Ger. Vossius, that we have noted above. The original of which seems to have been this mistaken passage of Plutarch, who, after he has related how the bones of Theseus were brought in pomp to Athens by Cimon, Ἔθεντο δὲ, says he, καὶ† εἰς μνήμην ΑΥΤΟΥ καὶ τὴν τῶν τραγῳδῶν κρίσιν ὀνομαστὴν γενομένην.[q] Now, it seems that some believed ΑΥΤΟΥ to be spoken of Theseus; and from thence they coined the story of tragedies being acted at his tomb. But it plainly relates to Cimon, who, with the rest of the gene-

[k] Ibid. [l] Plut. Cimon. [m] Diod. p. 45.
[n] Petav. Doctr. Temp. ii. p. 570. [o] Ibid. p. 567.
[* See note p. 264.—D.] [p] Inde tragœdorum institutus est agon.
[† καὶ not in eds. of Plut.—D.] [q] Plut. Cim.

rals, sat judge of the plays of Sophocles and Æschylus at that Olymp. LXXVII. 4., and gave the victory to the former.[r] Upon the whole, then; first, it appears, against Mr. B., that tragedies were not acted among the solemnities at Theseus's tomb; and, secondly, that Theseus's tomb was not built till Olymp. LXXVII. 4., in Æschylus's and Sophocles's time, long after Thespis: so that, were it true that tragedies had been one of those funeral solemnities, yet it would be no argument for that antiquity that Mr. B. assigns to tragedy. But these are mistakes of his, only for want of reading: the next that I am going to mention, let others judge from what want it proceeds. The case is this: a certain writer has accused Mr. B. of a false citation of Plutarch's Life of Theseus, *for there's no such thing as he quotes in that Life. In the Life of Cimon, indeed, there's something that an ignorant person might construe to such a sense.*[s] To this Mr. B. replies, that he owns he was misled by Jul. Scaliger, who affirms the thing, but quotes nobody for it; *and perhaps*, says Mr. B. further, *I was too hasty in not fully considering the whole passage of Plutarch in the Life of Cimon, relating to this matter*. (p. ult. 3d Edit.) Now, this excuse implies an affirmation that he had his eye on that passage in the Life of Cimon, when he wrote that about tragedies at Theseus's tomb. But the contrary of this is manifest from his own book; for he quotes not the Life of Cimon, but the Life of Theseus, where there is not one syllable of tragedies. So that he quoted Plutarch *at a venture*, without looking into him at all. Where's the truth, then, of his *not* FULLY *considering?* If Mr. B.'s very excuses stand in need of excuse, how inexcusable must the rest be!

'Twas the Examiner's purpose to shew some footsteps of tragedy before the time of Thespis. But he has not observed a passage of Herodotus, (because his second-hand writers did not furnish him with it,) which of all others had been

[r] Plut. ibid. See Marm. Arund. Epoch 57.

[s] View of Dissert. p. 72. [See note p. 264.—D.]

fittest for his turn. *The Sicyonians*, says that historian, in *every respect honoured the memory of Adrastus, and particularly they celebrated the story of his life with tragical choruses; not making Bacchus the subject of them, but Adrastus. But Clisthenes assigned the choruses to Bacchus, and the rest of the festival to Melanippus.*[t] This Clisthenes, here spoken of, was grandfather to Clisthenes the Athenian, who was the main agent in driving out the sons of Pisistratus, at Olymp. LXVII. And, since *tragical choruses* were used in Sicyon before that Clisthenes's time, it appears they must be long in use before the time of Thespis, who was one generation younger than Clisthenes himself. And agreeably to this, Themistius tells us, *that the Sicyonians were the inventors of tragedy, and the Athenians the finishers.*[u] And when Aristotle says, *that some of the Peloponnesians pretend to the invention of it,*[v] I understand him of these Sicyonians. Now, if Mr. B. had but met with this place of Herodotus, with what triumphing and insulting would he have produced it! what plenty of scurrility and grimace would he have poured out on this occasion! But I have so little apprehensions, either of the force of this argument, or of Mr. B.'s address in managing it, that I here give him notice of it, for the improvement of his next Edition. The truth is, there is no more to be inferred from these passages, than that, before the time of Thespis, the first grounds and rudiments of tragedy were laid: there were choruses and extemporal songs, *αὐτοσχεδιαστικά*, but nothing *written* nor published as a dramatic poem: so that Phalaris is still to be indicted for a Sophist, for saying his two fairy* poets *wrote* tragedies against him.[w] Nay, the very word *tragedy* was not heard of then at Sicyon; though Herodotus names

[t] Herod. v. c. 67. Τὰ πάθεα αὐτοῦ τραγικοῖσι χοροῖσι ἐγέραιρον.

[u] Them. Orat. xix. [= xxvii. p. 337. *ed. Hard.*—D.] Τραγῳδίας εὑρεταὶ μὲν Σικυώνιοι, τελεσιουργοὶ δὲ Ἀττικοὶ ποιηταί.

[v] Arist. Poët. 3. [= v. *ed. Tyrw.*—D.]

[* See p. 275. and note.—D.]

[w] Epist. 63, 97.

τραγικοὺς χορούς, *the tragical choruses;* which by and by shall be considered.

Mr. B. is so very obliging, *that, if I'll suffer myself to be taught by him,* he'll set me right (p. 172.) in my notion of tragedy. I am willing to be *taught* by any body, much more by the great Mr. B.; though, as to this particular of tragedy, I dare not honour myself, as Mr. B. honours his teacher, by telling him, *that the foundation of all the little knowledge I have in this matter was laid by him* (p. 59). For there's nothing true in the long lecture that he reads to me here about tragedy, but what I might have learned out of Aristotle, Julius Scaliger, Gerard Vossius, Marmora Oxoniensia, and other common books. And as for the singularities in it, which I could not have learned in other places, (if I, who am here to be *taught,* may use such freedom with my *master,*) they are such lessons as I hope I am now too old to learn. I will not sift into them too minutely; for I'll observe the respect and distance that's due to him from his *scholar.* But there's one particular that I must not omit; when he tells me, as out of Aristotle, that the subject of primitive tragedy was *satirical reproofs of vicious men and manners of the times* (p. 173.): so that he explains very dexterously, as he thinks, the expression of Phalaris, *that the poets wrote tragedies* AGAINST *him;* for the meaning, he says, is this, *that they wrote lampoons and abusive satirical copies of verses upon him* (p. 180, 181). But it were well if this would be a warning to him, when he next pretends to *teach* others, to consider first, how lately he himself came from school. The words of Aristotle, that he refers to, are, *that tragedy at first was* σατυρική;[x] which Mr. B., in his deep judgment and reading, interprets *satire and lampoon,* confounding the *satyrical* plays of the Greeks with the *satire* of the Romans; though it's now above a hundred years since Casaubon[y] writ a whole book on pur-

[x] Arist. Poët. 4. [=x. *ed. Tyrw.*—D.]

[y] Is. Casaub. de Satyricâ et Satirâ. Par. 1595.

pose to shew they had no similitude nor affinity with one another. The Greek *satyrica*, was only a jocose sort of tragedy, consisting of a chorus of Satyrs (from which it had its name), that talked lasciviously, befitting their character; but they never gave *reproofs to the vicious men of the times;* their whole discourse being directed to the action and story of the play, which was Bacchus, or some ancient hero turned a little to ridicule. There's an entire play of this kind yet extant, the *Cyclops* of Euripides; but it no more concerns the *vicious men* at Athens in the poet's *time* than his *Orestes* or his *Hecuba* does. As for the abusive poem or *satire* of the Romans, it was an invention of their own; *Satira tota nostra est*, says Quintilian,[z] *satire is entirely ours:* and if the Greeks had any thing like it, 'twas not the satyrical plays of the tragic poets, but the old comedy, and the *silli* made by Xenophanes, Timon, and others. *Satire*, says Diomedes, *among the* ROMANS *is* NOW *an abusive poem, made to reprove the vices of men.*[a] Here we see 'twas a poem of the Romans, not of the Greeks; and 'twas *now*, that is, after Lucilius's time, that it became abusive; for the satire of Ennius and Pacuvius was quite of another nature. And now, which of my *masters* must I be *taught* by? by Quintilian and Diomedes? or by the young Orbilius, that has lashed Scaliger and Salmasius at that insolent rate? (p. 215.) But Mr. B. offers to prove that the old tragedy had a mixture of lampoon, from Thespis's cart that he carried his plays in; *from which cart*, says he, *scurrility and buffoonery were so usually uttered, that ἐξαμάξειν and ἐξ ἁμάξης λέγειν became proverbial expressions for satire and jeering* (p. 180). What an odious word's here, *ἐξαμάξειν*! Sure all the *buffoonery* of that cart he talks of could not be so nauseous as this one barbarism. I desire to know in what original author (for his second-hand gentlemen he must excuse me) this wonderful word may be found, the original of which seems a mistake of *ἐξ ἁμαξῶν* for a participle

[z] Quint. x. 1. [a] Diomed. p. 482.

ἐξαμάξων. But, to leave this to keep company with *Ἀντιγονίδαι* and *Σελευκίδαι*,[b] I'll crave leave to tell him that they were other *carts*, and not Thespis's, that this proverb *τὰ ἐξ ἁμαξῶν* was taken from. For they generally used carts in their pomps and processions, not only in the festivals of Bacchus, but of other gods too. And particularly in the Eleusinian feast, the women were carried in the procession in *carts*, out of which they abused and jeered one another: Aristophanes in *Plutus*;*

> *Μυστηρίοις δὲ τοῖς μεγάλοις ὀχουμένην*
> *Ἐπὶ τῆς ἁμάξης.*

Upon which passage the old Scholiast[c] and Suidas[d] have this note: *that in those carts the women ἐλοιδόρουν ἀλλήλαις, made abusive jests one upon another;* and especially at a bridge over the river Cephissus, where the procession used to stop a little; from whence to *abuse* and *jeer* was called *γεφυρίζειν*.[e] These Eleusinian carts are mentioned by Virgil, in the first of his *Georgics*;

> *Tardaque Eleusinæ matris volventia* plaustra:[f]

which most of the interpreters have been mistaken in; for the poet means not that Ceres invented them, but that they were used at her feasts. But, besides the Eleusinian, there was the same custom in many other festival pomps; whence it was that *πομπεύειν* and *πομπεία* came at last to signify *scoffing* and *railing*. So Demosthenes takes the word; and his Scholiast says,[g] *that in those* pomps *they used to put on vizards, and riding in the carts abuse the people; from whence,* says he, *comes the proverb, ἐξ ἁμάξης με ὕβρισε*; which Demosthenes uses in the same oration.[h] So that the

[b] See here, p. 186. [* v. 1013. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]
[c] Schol. Arist. p. 48. [*Schol. to ed. Bekk.* p. 351.—D.]
[d] Suid. in Τὰ ἐξ ἁμαξῶν. [e] Hesych. Γεφ.
[f] Georg. i. v. 163. [g] Demost. de Coronâ, p. 134. edit. Par.
[h] P. 159.

very passage of this orator which Mr. B. cites in his margin is not meant of the carts of *tragedians*. 'Tis true, Harpocration[i] and Suidas[j] understand it of the *pomp* in the feasts of Bacchus; but even there too they were not the *tragic*, but the *comic* poets who were so abusive; for they also had their carts to carry their plays in. *The comic poets*, says the Scholiast on Aristophanes,[k] *rubbing their faces with lees of wine, that they might not be known, were carried about in carts, and sung their poems in the highways; from whence came the proverb,* ὡς ἐξ ἁμάξης λαλεῖ, *to rail as impudently as out of a cart.* Mr. B. concludes this paragraph with a kind hint, *that the Doctor may perhaps, before he dies, have a convincing proof, that a man may be the subject of such tragedies* (i. e. *such lampoons and abuses from carts,*) *while he is living* (p. 180). I heartily thank him for telling the world what worthy adversaries I am like to have, and what honourable weapons they will use; and, to requite his kindness, I assure him, that I shall no more value, nor be concerned at, those *lampooning tragedies*, than if they were really spoken *out of carts*, which perhaps may still be the fittest stage for such kind of tragedians.

There are two passages of Horace and Plutarch that concern the rise and origin of tragedy;

> *Ignotum tragicæ genus invenisse camenæ*
> *Dicitur, et plaustris vexisse poëmata Thespis.*[l]

And Ἀρχομένων τῶν περὶ Θέσπιν ἤδη τὴν τραγῳδίαν κινεῖν.[m] Now, the first of these, as Mr. B. glosses upon it, means, it was *an unknown kind of tragic poetry which Thespis found out, and implies there was another known kind in use before him* (p. 175). The latter, he says, may import, that Thespis did not invent, *but only gave life and motion to tragedy*, by

[i] Harp. in Πομπεία. Διονυσιακαῖς ἑορταῖς.
[j] Suid. in Ἐξ ἁμάξης. Ἐν Ληναίοις.
[k] Schol. Arist. p. 76. [*Schol. to ed. Bekk.* p. 102.—D.]
[l] Hor. in Arte Poët. [v. 275.—D.]
[m] Plut. in Solone.

making it dramatic (p. 176). Now, Mr. B. either seriously believes these interpretations, or not. If he *does*, the best advice his friends can give him is, to trouble his head no more with critic, for it will never do him credit. If he *does not* believe them, where's that modesty *becoming a young writer* (Pref.), or that sincerity becoming a gentleman, or that prudence becoming a man? 'Tis a dangerous thing to trifle with the world, and to put those things upon others which he believes not himself. No man ever despised his readers, that did not suffer for't at the last. However, whether Mr. B. believes these interpretations or not, I am resolved not to refute them. For, though I have often had already, and shall have still, a very ignoble employment, in answering some of his little cavils, yet I have spirit enough to think that there may be *some* drudgery so very mean as to be really below me.

We are come now to the last point about *tragedy*, and that is the origin of the *name*. I had observed, *that the name of tragedy was no older than the thing; as sometimes it happens, when an old word is borrowed and applied to a new notion.* So that the very word τραγῳδία, which the false Phalaris uses in his *Epistles*, was not so much as heard of in the days of the true one. Mr. B. commences his answer to this with an acuteness familar to him. *What does he mean?* says he: names, *I thought, were invented to signify* things, *and that the* things *themselves must be, before the* names *by which they are called* (p. 178). Now, I leave it to the sagacious reader to discover, what I cannot do, the pertinency and the drift of this passage of Mr. B.'s. However, let it belong to any thing or nothing, 'tis a proposition false in itself, *that things themselves must be, before the names by which they are called.* For we have many new tunes in music made every day, which never existed before; yet several of them are called by *names* that were formerly in use; and perhaps the tune of *Chevy Chase*, though it be of famous antiquity, is a little younger than the name of the chase itself. And I humbly conceive, that Mr. Hobbes's book,

which he called the *Leviathan*, is not quite as ancient as its name is in Hebrew. So very fortunate is Mr. B. when he endeavours at subtilty and niceness. 'Tis true, where *things* are eternal, or as old as the world, which we call the works of nature, they *must* be older than the *names* that are given them; but in things of art or notion, that have their existence from man's intellect or manual operation, *the things themselves* may be many years younger *than the names by which they are called;* and so the thing tragedy may possibly be younger than the name that it is called by.

The reason, therefore, why I affirmed *that the name of tragedy was no older than the thing*, was because good authors assured me that the word *tragedy*[n] was first coined from the *goat* that was the prize of it, which prize was first constituted in Thespis's time.* So the Arundel Marble in the Epoch of Thespis, *Καὶ ἆθλον ἐτέθη ὁ τράγος, and the* goat *was appointed for the prize.* So Dioscorides, in his epigram upon Thespis;†

——— ᾧ τράγος ἆθλον.

And Horace, speaking of the same person;

Carmine qui tragico vilem certavit ob hircum.‡

And because I was fully persuaded by them that this was the true etymology of the word, and that the guesses of some grammarians, *τραγῳδία quasi τρυγῳδία*, or *τραγῳδία quasi τραχεῖα ᾠδή*, and other such like, were absurd and ridiculous; I thought, as I do still, that the very name of tragedy was no older than Thespis; and consequently could not have been found in the *Epistles* of the true Phalaris.

[n] Τραγῳδία. Τράγος.

[* Certain scholars are of opinion that the goat was the prize in the ancient Bacchic choruses, and that the passages above adduced by Bentley are only to be understood as shewing that it continued to be the prize after the innovations of Thespis. The subject is certainly involved in great obscurity.—D.]

[† See p. 283.—D.]

[‡ *Ar. Poët.* v. 220.—D.]

But I have not forgot what I myself lately quoted out of Herodotus, that the Sicyonians before Thespis's time honoured the memory of Adrastus τραγικοῖσι χοροῖσι, *with tragical choruses.*[o] If this be so, here appears an ample testimony that the *word* tragedy was older than Thespis. But for a man that meddles with this kind of learning, the first stock to set up and prosper with is sound *judgment*, which gives the very name and being to *critic*, and without which he will never be able to steer his course successfully among many seeming contradictions. As in this passage of Herodotus, which is contrary to what others assure us, what course is to be taken? Must we stand dubious and neuters between both, and cry out upon *the uncertainty of heathen chronology?* or must we not rather say, that Herodotus, who himself lived many years after Thespis, when tragedy was frequent and improved to its highest pitch, made use of a *prolepsis* when he called them τραγικοὺς χορούς, meaning such choruses as gave the first rise to that which in his time was called tragedy? So we have seen before, that Porphyry, and Jamblichus, and Conon,[p] speak of Tauromínium at a time when that name was not yet heard of; but they meant the city Naxos, that was afterwards called so. Such an anticipation is common and familiar in all sorts of writers. And if Herodotus, in another place, where he says, *that the Epidaurians* (long before Susarion lived in Attica) *honoured the goddesses Damia and Auxesia* χοροῖσι γυναικηΐοισι κερτόμοισι, *with choruses of women, that used to abuse and burlesque the women of the country,*[q] had called them χοροῖσι κωμικοῖσι, *comical choruses*, he had said nothing unworthy of a great historian; because those choruses of women were much of the same sort that were afterwards called comical, though perhaps at that time the word *comical* was not yet minted.

But let us see what Mr. B. advances, to shew that the name of tragedy is older than Thespis. *It cannot reason-*

[o] Herod. v. c. 67. [p] P. 233. [q] Herod. v. c. 83.

ably be questioned, says he, *but that those* Bacchic hymns *they sung in chorus round their altars* (*from whence the regular tragedy came*) *were called by this name* tragedy *from* τράγος, *the goat, the sacrifice at the offering of which these odes were sung* (p. 178). But he presently subjoins, *that as to this we are in the dark, and have only probabilities to guide us* (p. 179). If we are *in the dark*, I dare affirm that the Examiner will leave us so still, for it is not his talent to give light to any thing, but rather to make it darker than it was before. *It cannot reasonably*, he says, *be questioned*. Why not? I pray. Because it would be a *question* that he could not answer. I know no other *unreasonableness* in questioning it; for he has not one authority for what he supposes here, that the name of tragedy was as old as the institution of sacrificing a *goat* to Bacchus. But, on the contrary, we have express testimonies that it was no ancienter than when the *goat* was made the *prize* to be contended for by the poets. As, besides the passages cited before, Eusebius says in his *Chronicle*, *Certantibus in agone tragos*, i. e. *hircus*, *in præmio dabatur, unde aiunt tragœdos nuncupatos*. So Diomedes the grammarian, *Tragœdia à* τράγῳ *et* ᾠδῇ *dicta, quoniam olim actoribus tragicis* τράγος, *id est, hircus, præmium cantûs proponebatur*. Etymol. Mag., Κέκληται τραγῳδία, ὅτι τράγος τῇ ᾠδῇ ἆθλον ἐτιθετο. Philargyrius on Virgil's *Georgics*, *Dabatur hircus, præmii nomine, unde hoc genus poëmatis tragœdiam volunt dictam*.[q] All the other derivations of the word *tragedy* are to be slighted and exploded. But if this be the true one, as certainly it is, the word cannot possibly be ancienter than Thespis's days, who was the first that contended for this prize. Besides this, we have very good authority, that *those Bacchic hymns, from whence the regular tragedy came*, were originally called by another name, not *tragedy*, but *dithyramb*. So Aristotle expressly teaches; *Tragedy*, says he, *had its first rise from those that sung the dithyramb*.[r] Διθύραμβος, says Suidas, ὕμνος εἰς Διόνυσον,

[q] Georg. ii. v. 183.

[r] Arist. Poët. iv. [=ix. *ed. Tyrw.*—D.] Ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξαρχόντων τὸν διθύραμβον.

i. e. *Dithyramb means the Bacchic hymn.* The first author of the *dithyramb*, as some relate,[s] was Lasus Hermionensis, in the first Darius's time; or, as others,[t] Arion Methymnæus, in the time of Periander. But, as it appears from Pindar and his Scholiast,[u] the antiquity of it was so great, that the inventor could not be known: and Archilochus, who was much older than both Lasus and Arion, has the very word *dithyramb* in these wonderful and truly *dithyrambic* verses;[v]

> Ὡς Διωνύσοι' ἄνακτος καλὸν ἐξάρξαι μέλος
> Οἶδα διθύραμβον, οἴνῳ συγκεραυνωθεὶς φρένας.

So the verses are to be corrected and distinguished, being a pair of *trochaics*. And Mr. B. may please to observe, that Archilochus too, as well as Suidas, defines a *dithyramb* to be a *Bacchic hymn*, which Mr. B. erroneously makes to be peculiar to tragedy. I will tell him also anon, that the chorus belonging to the *dithyramb* was not called a *tragic*, but *cyclian* chorus.

Mr. B. has failed in his first attempt about the date of the word *tragedy*; but he has still another stratagem to bring about his design. For he will prove that *τραγῳδία comprehended originally both tragedy and comedy* (p. 179.); and since comedy was as ancient as Susarion, who was near forty years older than Thespis, it follows that the word *τραγῳδία*, which comedy was then called by, must be older too than Thespis. This being the point he promised to prove, he presently shifts hands and changes the question; for he has quoted five passages, one out of Athenæus, three out of

[s] Suid. Λάσος. Arist. Schol. p. 362, 421. [*Schol. to ed. Bekk.* p. 180, 263. —D.]

[t] Suid. Ἀρίων. Arist. Schol. 421. [*Schol. ibid.* p. 263.—D.] Dion. Chrysost. p. 455.

[u] Pind. Olymp. xiii.

[v] Athen. p. 628. [=V. 276. *ed. Schw.*, who, it appears (*Anim.* VII. 420.), was not aware that Porson (*ad Medeam*, v. 189, 140.) had corrected his erroneous statement (*ad Orest.* v. 5.) regarding Bentley's arrangement of these lines.—D.]

the Scholiast on Aristophanes, and one out of Hesychius, to shew that τρυγῳδία signifies *comedy*. Which is a thing so known and common, and confessed by all, that he might as well take pains to prove κωμῳδία signifies comedy. But what's all this to τραγῳδία? Must τραγῳδία signify *comedy*, because τρυγῳδία does? An admirable argument, and one of Mr. B.'s beloved sort! He may prove too, whensoever he pleases, that *lacerna* means a *lamp*, because *lucerna* does; and a great many other feats may be performed by this argument. But in his other citations, with which his margin is plentifully stuffed out, there's one to shew that τρυγῳδία signifies *tragedy*, and two that τραγῳδία signifies *comedy* (p. 179). Now, the first of these is besides the question again; for though τρυγῳδία should stand both for τραγῳδία and κωμῳδία, yet it does not at all follow that τραγῳδία may stand for κωμῳδία. If Mr. B. had studied his new Logic more, and his Phalaris less, he had made better work in the way of reasoning. 'Tis as if some school-boy should thus argue with his master: *pomum* may signify *malum* an *apple*, and *pomum* too may signify *cerasum* a *cherry*; therefore *malum* an *apple* may signify *cerasum* a *cherry*. But, besides the failure in the consequence, the proposition itself is false, for τρυγῳδία does not signify *tragedy*: nay, to see the strange felicity of Mr. B.'s critic, even his other assertion is false too, for τραγῳδία never signifies *comedy*. Let us examine his instances.

Τρυγῳδία, says Mr. B., *signifies* tragedy *properly so called, in this passage of Aristophanes;*[w]

——Αὐτὸς δ' ἔνδον ἀναβάδην ποιεῖ
Τρυγῳδίαν——

For this is spoken of Euripides (p. 179). But what then? *Why, Euripides being a tragic poet,* τρυγῳδία, *when applied to him, must needs signify tragedy.* I am unwilling to dis-

[w] Arist. Acharn. p. 278. [= v. 374. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

courage a gentleman, and yet I cannot but take notice of his unlucky hand whenever he meddles with authors. Here he interprets *τρυγῳδία tragedy;* and yet the very jest and wit of this passage consists in this, that the poet calls Euripides's plays *comedies.** And so the Scholiast interprets it; *τρυγῳδίαν δὲ εἶπεν, ἀντὶ τοῦ κωμῳδίαν.* Euripides was accused by Aristophanes, and several of the ancients, for debasing the majesty and grandeur of tragedy, by introducing low and despicable characters instead of heroic ones, and by making his persons discourse in a mean and popular style, but one degree above common talk in comedy; contrary to the practice of Æschylus and Sophocles, who aspired after the sublime character, and by metaphors and epithets and compound words made all their lines strong and lofty. And particularly in Aristophanes's *Ranæ,*[x] where Æschylus and Euripides are compared together, the latter is pleasantly burlesqued and rallied on this very account. What could Aristophanes, then, say smarter in this passage about him, than, in derision of his style and characters, to call his tragedies *comedies?*

Well, let us see if, in his next point, Mr. B. is more fortunate; *that τραγῳδία may signify comedy. There's a fragment,* he says (p. 179.), *of Aristophanes's ΓΗΡΥΤΑΔΗΣ preserved, where τραγῳδὸς signifies a comedian;*[y]

Καὶ τίνες ἂν εἶεν; πρῶτα μὲν Σαννυρίων
Ἀπὸ τῶν τραγῳδῶν, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν τραγικῶν χορῶν,
Μέλητος, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν κυκλικῶν, Κινησίας.

Now, Sannyrion being a comic poet, as it's very well known,

[* "Perperàm in impressis *τρυγῳδίαν.* Nullum hîc cum Bentleio, alioquin "verè statuente tragœdiam nunquam *τρυγῳδίαν* appellatam fuisse, quærendum "acumen est, tanquam si Comicus innuere vellet, Euripidis dramata nihil tra-"gicæ majestatis habere, et pro comœdiis habenda esse. Hic jocus personæ, "cui tribuitur, Cephisophonti, Euripidis famulo, minimè convenit." *Brunck ad l.*—Elmsley and Bekker also give *τραγῳδίαν.*—D.]

[x] Arist. Ran. p. 167, &c. [=v. 926, &c. *ed. Bekk.:* for Bentley refers to *ed. Basil.* 1547.—D.]

[y] Athen. p. 551. [=IV. 548. *ed. Schw.*—*Fr.* ΓΗΡΥ. ix. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

'tis a clear case, as Mr. B. thinks, that ἀπὸ τῶν τραγῳδῶν means *one of the comedians*. No doubt the poet meant to say, that Sannyrion was sent ambassador from the *comic* poets, Meletus from the *tragic*, and Cinesias from the *dithyrambic*. This was Aristophanes's thought; and therefore I affirm that his words could not be ἀπὸ τῶν τραγῳδῶν, as now they are read. So far from that, that if τραγῳδῶν *could* signify comedians, yet he would not have used the word in this place, where τραγικῶν χορῶν immediately follows. For what a wretched ambiguity would be here, and wholly unworthy of so elegant a poet! since τραγῳδῶν and τραγικῶν χορῶν are words of the same import; and if the former may signify *comedy*, the latter may do so too. So that, if the persons Sannyrion and Meletus had not been well known, the passage might appear a mere tautology; *tragedians* and *tragedians*, or *comedians* and *comedians*; or if the signification was varied, the one word meaning comedians, and the other tragedians, yet it had been uncertain whether of the two was the comedian, and whether the tragedian, because both the words, according to Mr. B., may be interpreted in either signification. These, I conceive, are such just exceptions against the vulgar reading of this passage, that a person who esteems Aristophanes as he deserves, may safely say he never wrote it so. If critic had ever once smiled upon Mr. B., or if there was not a kind of fatality in his errors, he could scarce have missed this most certain correction;

——Πρῶτα μὲν Σαννυρίων
Ἀπὸ τῶν τρυγῳδῶν——

by which all the ambiguity or tautology vanishes; for τρυγῳδὸς never signified any thing but a comedian. And how easy and natural was the depravation of τρυγῳδῶν into τραγῳδῶν! τρυγῳδὸς being the much rarer word, and, as I believe, not to be met with in prose or serious writings; for it was a kind of jeering name, and not so honourable as κωμῳδός. However, the corruption of this passage is very

ancient; for the author of the *Epitome* of Athenæus, who lived before Eustathius's time, *i. e.* above D. years ago, read it *τραγῳδῶν*, for here he calls Sannyrion a *tragedian.*[z] But in Ælian's days the true reading *τρυγῳδῶν* was still extant in Athenæus; for that author transcribes this very passage into his *Various History*, and from it he calls Sannyrion a *comedian*,[a] and Melitus a *tragedian.*

But that Mr. B. may not wonder at the change of *τρυγῳδῶν* into *τραγῳδῶν*, I'll tell him of one or two other corruptions in the very same passage;

——*Ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν τραγικῶν χορῶν,*
Μέλητος, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν κυκλικῶν, Κινησίας.

For the learned Casaubon, instead of *Μέλητος*, reads it *Μέλιτος*: *because*, says he, *neither this verse here, nor any other wherein he is mentioned, will allow the second syllable of his name to be long.*[b] But, with humble submission, whether his name be written *Μέλιτος* or *Μέλητος*,* I affirm, that those very verses both *allow* and require that the second syllable of it should be long. As first in this of Aristophanes, if the first syllable of *κυκλικῶν* be short, the second of *Μέλιτος* must be long. Casaubon, 'tis true, as his observation shews, believed the first of *κυκλικῶν* to be of necessity long; but as it's plain that it *may* be short, so, that it actually is so in several passages (I might say all) of the same poet, will be seen by and by. The other verse that Casaubon produces is this out of *Ranæ;*

Σκολιῶν Μελίτου, καὶ Καρικῶν αὐλημάτων.

But even here too the second syllable of *Μελίτου* is long;

[z] Epit. Athen. MS. *Σαννυρίωνα τὸν τραγῳδόν.*

[a] Æl. Var. Hist. x. 6. *Σαννυρίων ὁ κωμῳδίας ποιητής.*

[b] Casaub. ad Athen. p. 857.

[* It should be written *Μέλητος*: see Porson's *Notæ in Aristoph. ed. Dobree*, p. 79. and *Addenda*, p. 124.—D.]

for *ΚΑΙ* ought to be struck out, as will be plain from the whole passage;[c]

> *Οὗτος δ' ἀπὸ πάντων μὲν φέρει πορνιδίων,**
> *Σκολιῶν Μελίτου, Καρικῶν αὐλημάτων,*
> *Θρήνων, χορείων· τάχα δὲ δηλωθήσεται.*

Who does not see now that if *ΚΑΙ* be inserted in the second verse, a great part of the elegancy is lost? for the whole sentence runs on without any particle of conjunction. But, to put the matter quite out of doubt, this very verse is cited in Suidas,[d] and *ΚΑΙ* does not appear there; but it easily crept into the text, because the next word begins with the same letters, *ΚΑ*. Upon the whole, therefore, the fault that Casaubon found in the passage of Athenæus is really none. But there is one which he did not find, and that is *κυκλικῶν* instead of *κυκλίων*: for the verse should be corrected thus;

> *Μέλητος, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν κυκλίων, Κινησίας.*

So Ælian[e] cites it from this very place; *Κινησίας κυκλίων χορῶν ποιητής*. And Aristophanes speaks so in other places;

> *Κυκλίων τε χορῶν ἀσματοκάμπτας, ἄνδρας μετεωροφένακας.*[f]

And again, speaking of the same Cinesias;

> *Ταυτὶ πεποίηκας τὸν κυκλιοδιδάσκαλον.*†

And so all manner of writers call them *κύκλιοι χοροὶ*, and never *κυκλικοὶ*; Suidas, Scholiasts on Pindar and Aristophanes, Heschyius, Plato, Plutarch, and others. This *cyclian* chorus was the same with the *dithyramb*, as some of

[c] Arist. Ran. p. 180. [= v. 1297. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

[* "Legendum autumavit Porsonus, *οὗτος δ' ἀπὸ πάντων πορνιδίων μέλη* "*φέρει*. Antepenultima enim in *πορνίδιον* corripitur." MALTBY, *Lexicon*, *note on v. πορν.*—D.]

[d] Suid. in *Μέλιτος*. [e] Æl. x. 6.

[f] Arist. Nub. p. 79. [= v. 332. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

[† *Aves*, v. 1403. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

these authors expressly say; and there were three choruses belonging to Bacchus, the *κωμικὸς*, the *τραγικὸς*, and the *κύκλιος*; the last of which had its prize and its judges at the *Dionysia*,[g] as the other two had. The famous Simonides won LVI. of these victories, as Tzetzes informs us from an epitaph upon that poet's tomb;[h]

Ἓξ ἐπὶ πεντήκοντα, Σιμωνίδη, ᾖραο νίκας
Καὶ τρίποδας, θνήσκεις δ' ἐν Σικελῷ πεδίῳ.
Κείῳ δὲ μνήμην λείπεις, Ἕλλησι δ' ἔπαινον
Εὐξυνέτου ψυχῆς τοῖς ἐπιγινομένοις.

So this epigram is to be corrected, for it's faulty in Tzetzes. Indeed, it is not expressed here what sort of victories they were; so that possibly there might be some of them obtained by his tragedies, if that be true which Suidas tells us, that Simonides made tragedies. But I rather believe that he won them all by his *dithyrambs* with the *cyclian* choruses; and I am confirmed in it by his own epigram, not published before;[i]

Ἓξ ἐπὶ πεντήκοντα, Σιμωνίδη, ᾖραο ταύρους
Καὶ τρίποδας, πρὶν τόνδ' ἀνθέμεναι πίνακα.
Τοσσάκι δ' ἱμερόεντα (διδαξάμενος) χορὸν ἀνδρῶν,
Εὐδόξου Νίκας ἀγλαὸν ἅρμ' ἐπέβης.

I have supplied the third verse with *διδαξάμενος*, which is wanting in the MS. But it's observable, that, instead of *Νίκας*, as it is in Tzetzes, the MS. epigram has *ταύρους*; which I take to be the author's own word, but, being not understood, it was changed into *Νίκας*. For *ταῦρος*, *a bull*, was the prize of *dithyramb*, as a *goat* was of *tragedy*; which

[g] Æsch. contra Ctesiph. p. 87. *Καὶ τοὺς μὲν κριτὰς τοὺς ἐκ Διονυσίων, ἐὰν μὴ δικαίως τοὺς κυκλίους χοροὺς κρίνωσι, ζημιοῦτε.*

[h] Tzetz. Chil. i. 24. [= p. 27. *ed. Kiess.*, where, in the last line, *σῆς* instead of *τοῖς*.—D.]

[i] Anthol. Epigr. MS. [*Anth. Gr. ex rec. Br.* (*ed. Jacobs.*) I. 69.—*Anth. Gr. ad fid. Cod. Pal. &c.* I. 253.—D.]

was the reason why Pindar gives to *dithyramb* the epithet of βοηλάτης;[j]

> Ταὶ Διωνύσου πόθεν ἐξέφαναν
> Σὺν βοηλάτᾳ Χαριτες
> Διθυράμβῳ———

He calls the dithyramb βοηλάτης, says the Scholiast, *because the bull was the prize to the winner, that animal being sacred to Bacchus.* And as the dithyrambic poets contended for a *bull*, so the harpers, κιθαρῳδοὶ, contended for a *calf*. Aristophanes;[k]

> Ἀλλ' ἕτερον ἥσθην, ἡνίκ' ἐπὶ μόσχῳ ποτὲ
> Δεξίθεος εἰσῆλθ' ᾀσόμενος Βοιώτιον.

Some, says the Scholiast, *interpret it* ἐπὶ μόσχῳ, *for a calf; because he that got the victory with his harp had a calf for his premium.* He seems indeed to give preference to the other exposition,* that makes Μόσχος the name of an harper, and the modern translators follow him in it; but the former is the true meaning of the passage, as both the language and the sense sufficiently shew. I will crave leave to add two things more relating to this matter: first, that this triple chorus, the *comic, tragic,* and *cyclian,* may perhaps be meant in that epigram of Dioscorides, which I have produced above;†

> Βάκχος ὅτε τριττὸν κατάγοι χορόν——

Neither shall I contend the point, if any one will embrace this exposition; but, for my own part, I prefer the other,

[j] Pind. Olymp. xv. [=xiii. 25. *ed. Heyn.*, where ἐξέφανεν.—D.]

[k] Acharn. p. 261. [=v. 13. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

[* "Neutra [interpretatio], quòd sciam, aliquâ auctoritate innititur, nisi "Scholiastæ, quæ quidem levissima est, et prorsùs indigna cui fides in re dubiâ "habeatur." ELMSLEY *ad loc.*—"An opinion of Welcker" (observes Mr. Mitchell, in his recent ed. of the *Acharn.* p. 5.) "seems to be gaining ground, "that nothing more is intended here than a mere jest; the poet, in allusion to "the derivation of the word Βοιώτιος, playfully combining a calf with the νόμος "B."—D.]

[† p. 260 and 283.—D.]

which makes it relate to *Trina Liberalia*, the three festivals of Bacchus. And, secondly, that these prizes, the bull and the calf, appointed for the dithyramb and playing on the harp, (if they really were continued till Simonides's death and Aristophanes's time, and if those passages of theirs related to the present custom, and not the first institution only,) may induce some to believe that the old prizes for tragedy and comedy might be continued too, though they be not taken notice of. However, be this as it will, the arguments used above[1] are not weakened at all by't. For it's plain, from the epochs of Æschylus, &c. in the Arundel Marble (where those prizes are not mentioned), that the epochs of Susarion* and Thespis (where they are mentioned) were proposed to us by that author as the first rise of comedy and tragedy.

Mr. B. has one passage more, which is his last anchor, to prove his notable point, *that the word* tragedy *may signify comedy*. 'Tis in the Greek *Prolegomena* to Aristophanes, gathered out of some nameless authors: the words are, *Ἔστι δὲ ταύτην (κωμῳδίαν) εἰπεῖν καὶ τραγῳδίαν, οἱονεὶ τρυγῳδίαν τινα οὖσαν, ὅτι τρυγίᾳ χριόμενοι ἐκωμῴδουν*; i. e. *Comedy may be called tragedy*, quasi *trygœdia, because the actors besmeared their faces with lees of wine.*[m] Here, we see, the testimony is positive and full, that comedy may be called tragedy, which is the thing that Mr. B. undertook to prove; and what is there now remaining, but to congratulate and applaud him? But I think one could hardly pitch upon a better instance, to shew that he that meddles with these matters must have *brains*, as Mr. B.'s phrase is, as well as eyes, *in his head*. A man that has that furniture in his upper story will discover, by the very next words in that nameless old author, that the passage is corrupted. For it immediately follows, *Καὶ τῆς μὲν τραγῳδίας τὸ εἰς ἔλεον*

[1] See above, p. 260, 301.

[* The old ed. has "*Sannyrion*;" a mistake noticed by Porson in his *Tracts, &c. ed. by Kidd*, p. 316.—D.]

[m] Proleg. Arist. p. ix. [=p. v. *ed. Bekk.*, where *οἷον τρυγ.*—D.]

κινῆσαι τοὺς ἀκροατὰς, τῆς δὲ κωμῳδίας τὸ εἰς γέλωτα. So that the whole sentence, as the common reading and Mr. B. has it, is thus; *Comedy may be also called tragedy: and 'tis the design of tragedy to excite compassion in the auditory; but of comedy to excite laughter.* Is not this, now, a most admirable period, and all one as if he had said, *Comedy may be called tragedy, for they are quite different things?* Without all doubt, if he had really meant, *comedy may be called tragedy*, in those following words he would have said *τῆς τραγῳδίας τῆς κυρίως λεγομένης, 'tis the design of tragedy properly so called;* and not have left them, as they now are, a piece of flat nonsense. But the fault, one may say, is now conspicuous enough; but what shall be done for an emendation of it? Even that too is very easy and certain; for, with the smallest alteration, the whole passage must be read thus; *Ἔστι δὲ ταύτην εἰπεῖν καὶ τρυγῳδίαν, οἱονεὶ τρυγῳδίαν τινα οὖσαν, ὅτι τρυγίᾳ χριόμενοι ἐκωμῴδουν.* And so we have it, in almost the very same words, in another writer among the same *Prolegomena*; *Τὴν αὐτὴν δὲ (κωμῳδίαν) καὶ τρυγῳδίαν φασὶν . . . ὅτι . . . τρυγὶ διαχρίοντες τὰ πρόσωπα ὑπεκρίνοντο.*[a] The import of both is, *that for κωμῳδία one may use the word τρυγῳδία*; which is true and right; for the words are synonymous, as appears from several places in Aristophanes and the old lexicographers.

I have now despatched all the Examiner's instances which he has brought to shew that *τρυγῳδία* may signify *tragedy*, or *τραγῳδία* signify *comedy*: and it would seem a very strange thing in any other writer but Mr. B., that he should bring half a dozen examples that are either false or nothing to his purpose, and be ignorant of that single one that is plainly and positively for him. I crave his leave to produce it here, and to change my adversary for a while, if Mr. B. will not be affronted, that I assign him a second so much inferior to him, the great Isaac Casaubon. This

[a] Ibid. p. vii. [= p. vi. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

author, in his most excellent book *De Satyricâ Poësi*, as Mr. B. has done, teaches us[o] *that at first both comedy and tragedy were called* τρυγῳδία *or* τραγῳδία, *as appears from Athenæus, where he says,*[p] *Both comedy and tragedy were found out in the time of vintage;* (τρύγης) ἀφ' οὗ δὴ καὶ τρυγῳδία τὸ πρῶτον ἐκλήθη καὶ κωμῳδία. *Which,* says Casaubon, *I thus correct;* ἐκλήθη καὶ ἡ τραγῳδία καὶ ἡ κωμῳδία, *that is, from which word* τρύγη, vintage, *both comedy and tragedy were at first called* τρυγῳδία. This is Casaubon's first proof; and we see it solely depends upon his own emendation of Athenæus, which, with humble submission, I take to be a very wrong one. For it is not in the text, as he has cited it, ἐκλήθη *KAI* κωμῳδία (which would truly shew some defect in it), but ἐκλήθη Ἡ κωμῳδία, both in his own and the other editions. He was deceived, therefore, by trusting to his *Adversaria*, without consulting the original; for there's no other pretence of altering the text, but from the particle *KAI*. He goes on, and tells us,[q] *that both* τρυγῳδία *and* τραγῳδία *were at first a common name both for tragedy and comedy; but afterwards it was divided,* διεσπάσθη, *as Aristotle says, and the ancient critics witness.* Now, the passage in Aristotle which he refers to has nothing at all either about tragedy or comedy, but it speaks of poetry in general; Διεσπάσθη δὲ κατὰ τὰ οἰκεῖα ἤθη ἡ ποίησις,[r] *that it was divided and branched into sorts according to the several humours of the writers; some singing the stories of heroes, others making drolls and lampoons, and a third sort hymns and encomiums, all as their several fancies lead* [led] *them.* But Mr. Casaubon subjoins this quotation following; Τραγῳδία τὸ παλαιὸν ἦν ὄνομα κοινὸν καὶ πρὸς τὴν κωμῳδίαν· ὕστερον δὲ τὸ μὲν κοινὸν ὄνομα ἔσχεν ἡ τραγῳδία, ἡ δὲ κωμῳδία ἴδιον; i. e. *Tragedy was of old a common name both for itself and comedy; but afterwards that common name became pecu-*

[o] Casaub. Satyr. p. 21.

[p] Athen. p. 40. [= I. 152. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

[q] Casaub. p. 22.

[r] Arist. Poët. cap. iv. [= vii. *ed. Tyrw.*—D.]

liar to tragedy, and the other was called comedy. Which passage is taken out of the *Etymologicon Magnum*, though a little interpolated and depraved by Casaubon himself. For that author, after he has given several etymologies of the word τραγῳδία, at last he says,[a] Ἡ ἀπὸ τῆς τρυγὸς τρυγῳδία· ἦν δὲ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦτο κοινὸν καὶ πρὸς τὴν κωμῳδίαν· ἐπεὶ οὔπω διεκέκριτο τὰ τῆς ποιήσεως ἑκατέρας· ἀλλ' εἰς αὐτὴν ἓν ἦν τὸ ἆθλον, ἡ τρύξ. ὕστερον δὲ τὸ μὲν κοινὸν ὄνομα ἔσχεν ἡ τραγῳδία· ἡ δὲ κωμῳδία ὠνόμασται, &c.; where we must not refer the words ὄνομα κοινὸν to τραγῳδία, as Casaubon does, but to τρυγῳδία, which immediately comes before; for the meaning of it is this, *that* τραγῳδία *might have its name, by a little variation, from* τρυγῳδία; *which word* τρυγῳδία *signified of old not tragedy only, but comedy too; for at that time these two sorts of poetry were not distinguished, but had one and the same prize* (τρύγα), *a vessel of wine: afterwards tragedy retained that old name* (υ only being changed into α), *and the other was called comedy.* 'Tis an error, therefore, in Casaubon, when he tells us, as from this writer, that τραγῳδία once signified *comedy*: for the thing that *this* writer affirms is this, that τρυγῳδία once signified both tragedy and comedy; which is a proposition very much different from that other of Casaubon's.

But, however, if this passage of the *Etymologicon* will not serve Casaubon's purpose, it may be useful to Mr. B.'s. 'Tis true, it will not come up to his main point which he undertook to make out, *that under the word* tragedy *both tragedy and comedy were at first comprehended* (p. 179.), (which alone, and nothing less than it, will signify any thing to the *age of tragedy*); yet it plainly affirms, what he by two mistaken instances in vain attempted to prove, *that* τρυγῳδία *once signified tragedy.* It concerns me, therefore, to give an answer to this passage, because I have already flatly denied that τρυγῳδία ever signified *tragedy.* And I think I need not be at much trouble for a reply, when the author

[a] Etymol. Mag. v. Τραγῳδ.

himself affords me one in this very place. For the grounds of his assertion he declares to be these two; that *τραγῳδία* is derived from *τρυγῳδία*; and that *τρὺξ*, wine, was the common prize both to comedy and tragedy. Now, both these are plain mistakes; for the true derivation of *τραγῳδία* is from *τράγος*, *a goat*, as I have fully shewn above; and that the prize was not the same, but the goat was for tragedy, and the wine for comedy, the Arundel Marble (to name no more) expressly affirms, in the Epochs of Susarion and Thespis. If the grounds, then, that he walks upon fail him, his authority too must fall with him; for he is alone, without any other to support him, all the rest confining the signification of *τρυγῳδία* to comedy alone. *Τρυγῳδεῖν, κωμῳδεῖν*, says Hesychius. *Τρυγῳδία, ἡ κωμῳδία*, says Aristophanes's Scholiast. In the present editions of Suidas we read *Τρυγοκωμῳδία*, without any exposition; but the true reading, as the very order of the alphabet shews, is *τρυγῳδία, κωμῳδία*; and so H. Stephanus affirms that he found it in his MS. All these three are older than the author of the *Etymologicon;* and if ever any before their time had used *τρυγῳδία* for tragedy, either all or some of them would have told us of it.

If I may have leave to talk without proof, as well as some others, I should rather suspect that *κωμῳδία* was the old and common name both for tragedy and comedy, till they came to be distinguished by their peculiar appellations. For the etymology of the word (*κωμῳδία, ἐν κώμαις ᾠδή*, *a song in villages*) agrees equally to them both; both tragedy and comedy being first invented and used in the villages, as all writers unanimously say. And 'tis remarkable that Dioscorides, in his epigrams, calls the plays of Thespis *κώμους*;[t]

Θέσπιδος εὕρεμα τοῦτο, τὰ δ' ἀγροιῶτιν ἀν' ὕλαν
Παίγνια, καὶ ΚΩΜΟΥΣ τούσδε τελειοτέρους.

[t] See above, p. 281, 283.

And again he says Thespis's plays were an entertainment to the *κωμῆται*;

Θέσπις ὅδε, τραγικὴν ὃς ἀνέπλασε πρῶτος ἀοιδὴν,
ΚΩΜΗΤΑΙΣ νεαρὰς καινοτομῶν χάριτας.

So that even Thespis's plays might at first, and for a little while, be called *comedies*, which was a word already in use from the time of Susarion. But when men understood the difference between the two sorts, and a distinct prize was appointed to Thespis's, it was natural to give each sort a particular name, taken from the several prizes; and the one was called *τραγῳδία*, from the goat,[u] the other *τρυγῳδία*, from the cask of wine.[v] The very likeness that is between the two words is no small confirmation that this account of them may be true: but I only propose it as a guess, to set against the conjecture of the author of the *Etymologicon*; and perhaps it might be accounted as probable as his, if it had not the disadvantage of coming so many centuries after it.

Mr. B. having at last made an end of his mistakes in this article *about tragedy*, I am very glad too to make an end of my animadversions upon them. For I am sensible how long I have detained the reader upon this subject; though I hope both the pleasure and the importance of it, and the vast number of faults that called upon me for correction, will excuse the prolixity: which I will not increase further by a repetition of what has been said; for even a short account of each, where the variety of things touched on is so great, would amount to a long story. I will only crave leave to say, that of the three points which the learned Mr. B. undertook to make out (p. 165.), every one has been carried against him; and that the incident mistakes which he has run into have not failed to increase in number proportionably as this article of his exceeded in length.

[u] *Τράγος.* [v] *Τρύξ.*

XII.

Had all other ways failed us of detecting this impostor, yet his very speech had betrayed him. For his language is Attic, the beloved dialect of the Sophists, in which all their μελέται, or *exercises*, were composed, in which they affected to excel each other, even to pedantry and solecism. But he had forgot that the scene of these *Epistles* was not Athens, but Sicily, where the Doric tongue was generally spoken and written; as, besides the testimonies of others, the very thing speaks itself in the remains of Sicilian authors, Sophron, Epicharmus, Stesichorus, Theocritus, Moschus, and others. How comes it to pass, then, that our Tyrant transacts every thing in Attic, not only foreign affairs of state, but domestic matters with Sicilian friends, but the very accounts of his household? Pray, how came that idiom to be the court language at Agrigentum? 'Tis very strange that a tyrant, and such a tyrant as he, should so doat on the dialect of a democraty, which was so eminently μισοτύραννος, the *hater of tyrants;* which, in his very days, had driven out Pisistratus, though a generous and easy governor: especially since, in those early times, before stage-poetry and philosophy and history had made it famous over Greece, that dialect was no more valued than any of the rest.

I would not be here mistaken, as if I affirmed that the Doric was absolutely universal or original in Sicily. I know that the old Sicani, the natives of the isle, had a peculiar language of their own, and that the Greek tongue there, like the Punic, was

only a foreigner, being introduced by those colonies that planted themselves there. Most of which coming from Corinth, Crete, Rhodes, &c. where all spoke the Doric dialect; thence it was that the same idiom so commonly obtained almost all over Sicily, as it appears to have done, to omit other testimonies, from the ancient medals of that island, ΤΑΥΡΟΜΕΝΙΤΑΝ, ΜΕΣΣΑΝΙΩΝ, ΘΕΡΜΙΤΑΝ, ΠΑΝΟΡΜΙΤΑΝ, ΛΙΛΥΒΑΙΙΤΑΝ, ΣΕΛΙΝΩΝΤΙΩΝ, &c.; all which words, inscribed upon their money, demonstrate the Doric dialect to have been then the language of those cities. 'Tis true there came some colonies to Sicily from Eubœa, and Samos, and other places; which, in those parts where they settled, might speak, for a while, the Ionic dialect, and afterwards, being mixed with the Dorians, might make a new sort of dialect, a compound of both: as Thucydides[w] observes of Himera, that the language of that city was at first a medley of Doric and Chalcidic. But that is no more than what happened even in Greece itself, where there were many *ὑποδιαιρέσεις τοπικαὶ*,[x] *local subdivisions* of every dialect, one country having always some singularity of speech not used by any other. But those little peculiarities do not hinder us from saying, in general, that the Sicilians spoke Doric. For the other dialects were swallowed up and extinguished by those two powerful cities of Dorian original, Syracuse and Agrigentum, that shared the whole island between them. Syracuse was a Corinthian colony, and spoke the

[w] Lib. vi. p. 414.

[x] Vetus Auctor περὶ Διαλέκτων. Herod. i. 142.

dialect of her mother city.[7] Agrigentum was first built by the Geloans of Sicily, who had been themselves a plantation of the Cretans and Rhodians, both of which were Dorian nations. So that, upon the whole, though in some other towns, and for a time, there might be a few footsteps of the Ionic dialect, yet our Sophist is inexcusable in making a Tyrant of Agrigentum, a city of Doric language and original, write epistles in such a dialect as if he had gone to school at Athens.

But some apologies have been offered for his using the Attic dialect; as, first, *because Phalaris was born at Astypalæa, an island of the Sporades, where was an Athenian colony.* This is thought to be a good account of his speaking in that idiom. It were easy to overthrow this argument at once, by refuting our spurious *Epistles*, and by shewing, from much better authority, that Phalaris was a Sicilian born. But I may speak perhaps of that by and by; and I'll have every proof I bring stand by itself, without the support of another. Let us allow, then, that Phalaris came from Astypalæa, an island of the Sporades, mentioned by Strabo[8] and Pliny.[9] 'Tis true some of the editors of Phalaris have discovered a new place of his birth, Astypalæa, a city of Crete, never mentioned before by any geographer, situate in the 370th deg. of longit., bearing south and by north off of Utopia. And I am wholly of their opinion, that he was born in that, or in none of them. But, because tradition is rather for the island, we will

[7] Theocrit. Id. xv.
[8] Lib. x. p. 488.
[9] Lib. iv. cap. 12.

beg their good leave to suppose it to be so: and there, as it seems, was formerly a plantation of Athenians; and Phalaris, being one of their posterity, must needs, for that reason, have a twang of their dialect. Now, what a pity 'tis that Phalaris himself, or his secretary, did not know of this plantation when he writ the cxx. letter to the Athenians, Ὦ σοφώτατοι γηγενεῖς Ἀθηναῖοι! What a fine compliment would he have made them upon that subject of their kindred! If any one know an express testimony that there was an Athenian colony at that Astypalæa, he can teach me more than I now remember. This I know in general, from Thucydides[b] and others, that the Athenians sent colonies to most of the islands; and so that may come in among the rest. But what then! Must the language for ever afterwards be Attic, wherever the Athenians once had footing? Thucydides says, in the same passage, that they planted Ionia. They had colonies at Miletus, at Ephesus, and most of the maritime towns of Asia Minor. Nay, the Ionians and the Attics were anciently one people, and the language the same: and when Homer says,*

Ἔνθα δὲ Βοιωτοὶ καὶ Ἰάονες ——

by the latter he is known to mean the Athenians.[c] And yet we see that, in process of time, the colonies had a different dialect from that of the mother nation. Why, then, must Astypalæa needs be Attic? and that so tenaciously, that twenty years living in Sicily could

[b] Thucyd. p. 10. Καὶ Ἴωνας μὲν Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ νησιωτῶν τοὺς πολλοὺς ἔφυσαν. Isocrat. Panathen. Plutarch. de Exilio.

[* Hom. *Il.* xiii. 685.—D.]

[c] Strabo, p. 333, 392.

not at all alter it in one of her islanders? He was part of that time a publican, or collector of taxes and customs:[d] could not that perpetual negoce* and converse with Dorians bring his mouth, by degrees, to speak a little broader? Would not he, that aimed at monarchy,[e] and for that design studied to be popular, have quitted his old dialect for that of the place, and not, by every word he spoke, make the invidious discovery of his being a stranger? But what if, after all, even the Astypalæans themselves should be found to speak Doric? If we make a conjecture from their neighbourhood, and the company they are put in, we can scarce question but they were Dorians. Strabo says[f] the island lies between Cos and Rhodes and Crete, *μεταξὺ τῆς Κῶ μάλιστα καὶ Ῥόδου καὶ Κρήτης.* And that all these three used the Doric dialect is too well known to need any proof. But to answer this in one word, we have direct evidence that this Astypalæa was a Dorian colony, and not an Athenian; for it was planted by the Megarians, as Scymnus Chius says expressly;[g]

> *Ἐν τῷ πόρῳ δὲ κειμένη τῷ Κρητικῷ*
> *Ἄποικός ἐστιν Ἀστυπάλαια Μεγαρέων,*
> *Νῆσος πελαγία.*

But let us hear the second apology for the Atticism of Phalaris. He is defended by the like practice of other writers, who, being Dorians born, repudiated their vernacular idiom for that of the Athenians; as

[d] Polyænus, Stratag. [* See Preface, p. liv.—D.]
[e] Ibid. [f] Lib. x. p. 488.
[g] Scymn. Ch. v. 550. [=549. p. 31. *G. V. Ox.* ii.—D.]

Diodorus of Agyrium and Empedocles of Agrigentum. So that though Phalaris be supposed to be a native of Sicily, yet here is an excuse for him for quitting the language. But I conceive, with submission, that this argument is built upon such instances as are quite different and aliene from the case of our *Epistles*.

The case of Empedocles and Diodorus, the one a poet, and the other an historian, is widely remote from that of our Tyrant. The former, being to write an epic poem, shewed an excellent judgment in laying aside his country dialect for that of the Ionians, which Homer and his followers had used before him, and had given it, as it were, the dominion of all heroic poetry. For the Doric idiom had not grace and majesty enough for the subject he was engaged in; being proper, indeed, for mimes, comedies, and pastorals, where men of ordinary rank are represented; or for epigrams, a poem of a low vein; or for lyrics, and the chorus of tragedy, upon the account of the Doric music; but not to be used in heroic without great disadvantage. And the historian likewise, with the rest of that and other Dorian nations, Philistus, Timæus, Ephorus, Herodotus, Dionysius Halic., &c., had great reason to decline the use of their vernacular tongue, as improper for history, which, besides the affectation of eloquence, aims at easiness and perspicuity, and is designed for general use. But the Doric is coarse and rustic, and always clouded with an obscurity; ἐχούσης τι καὶ ἀσαφὲς τῆς (Δωρίδος) διαλέκτου, says Porphyry,[h] who attributes

[h] Vita Pythag. p. 205.

the decay of the Pythagorean sect to their writing in that dialect. And now what affinity is there between Phalaris's case and that of historians or heroic poets? What mighty motives can be here for assuming a foreign dialect? The *Letters* are dated in the middle of Sicily, mostly directed to the next towns, or to some of his own domestics, about private affairs, or even the expenses of his family, and never designed for the public view. If any will still excuse the Tyrant for Atticising in those circumstances, 'tis hard to deny them the glory of being the faithfullest of his vassals.

The Examiner begins his remarks upon this article with a *point* that he owns *is not very material.* He acknowledges there are *several Attic ways of speech in the* Letters; but, for all that, they are not *properly Attic* (p. 34). Which cavil seems to be started here for no other design but to bring in that cutting jest, *that Dr. B. has abundance of pure Anglicisms in his Latin;* which when he, or any body for him, shall shew by instances, I'll then consider what to answer; but in the mean time it will pass for a calumny. He adds, *that Homer mixes Atticisms in his style, and yet nobody will say he wrote Attic.* Which is very crudely said, and shews Mr. B. had no true view of the progress of dialects. For if I should ask him, what the Attic dialect was in Homer's time, I might stay long enough before he could tell me. 'Tis well known that the Ionians were Athenian colonies,[i] and at first the Ionic and Attic were one and the same dialect. Now, those colonies were carried into Asia by Neleus[j] but CLXX. years before Homer was famous; and even Homer himself calls the Athenians Ἰάονες, *Ionians.* If I should say, then, that in Homer's

[i] See here, p. 358. [j] Marm. Arund.

time there was little or no difference between the Attic and Ionic language, how could Mr. B. disprove it? For the difference we now see between Homer and the Attic writers is no just measure in the case. Because Homer lived near CCC. years[k] before the Athenians had any writer of their own. So that, as we may gather from the proportion of time, there was not near so great a change made in the dialects between Neleus's and Homer's time, as between Homer's and Tyrtæus's or Solon's.

But he chastises me for saying, *that the Sophists affected to excel one another in writing Attic, even to pedantry and solecism.* For he declares, *he is at a loss for the meaning of this, and to him 'tis an incomprehensible degree of affectation* (p. 34). What Mr. B. *is at a loss for*, or what he cannot *comprehend*, I now know his reach too well to be very solicitous. He may say, therefore, if he pleases, that Lucian too writ nonsense, where he says, *that one Socrates was wont to rally* τοὺς σολοικίζοντας Ἀττικῶς, *those that affected* ATTIC SOLECISMS.[l] Here's the very same *incomprehensible* expression that I am reproved for by our great master of sense and language. But, for fear Lucian should have no better quarter from him in his next book than I had in his last, I'll endeavour to clear this point to the Examiner, so that, if possible, he may apprehend us both. 'Tis known that Philostratus and Ælian have been ever thought the most Attic of all the tribe of the Sophists. Now, the great Photius, where he gives us a character of Philostratus's style; *His syntax*, says he, *is so very odd, that no writer's was ever like it, for it looks more like solecism than any thing of syntax.*[m] *Neither does he this out of ignorance; but, because some of the ancients might speak so now and then, he does it every where with affectation.* And Eustathius, after he has given some instances of solecism in Euripides and

[k] Marm. Arund.

[l] Lucian. Solœc. p. 981.

[m] Photius, p. 540. Ἀσυνταξίαις μᾶλλον ἐοικέναι ἢ συντάξεως ὁτιοῦν μετέχειν.

Sophocles; *But that some,* says he, *of the old and good orators made solecisms on purpose, to give a new turn and quaintness to their style,*[n] *appears plainly in the writings of Philostratus.* This, we see, was the judgment of Photius and Eustathius, no despicable authors: and, by Mr. B.'s permission, I'll give an example or two to justify their censure. *Οἱ δὲ Ὠρεῖται,* says Philostratus, *χαλκαῖ μὲν αὐτοῖς αἱ πέτραι.*[o] Here's a plain solecism, a nominative case without any verb following it: another writer would have said, *Τοῖς δὲ Ὠρείταις, χαλκαῖ μὲν αἱ πέτραι.* Again, says he, *Καὶ πρὸς πυῤῥίχαις αὐτοὶ ὄντες, αὐλῶν μὲν μεστὰ πάντα ἦν.*[p] And again, *Τὸν λυπούμενον μὲν, κοιμίζεσθαι αὐτῷ τὴν λύπην ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐλοῦ.*[q] And again, *Δομετιανὸς ἐπιβουλεύειν ἑαυτῷ φήσας, οἱ μὲν εἰς νήσους καθείρχθησαν.*[r] All these are gross solecisms, *the last part of the sentence not agreeing nor answering to the first,* which is the proper definition of a solecism.[s] Corinthus too observes it as a peculiar way of the Attics to put nominatives instead of oblique cases; and he instances in Aristophanes and Philostratus.[t] I shall add to these a few passages out of Ælian, the other great pattern of the Attic style. *Οἱ ἵπποι,* says he, *τὰς κάτω βλεφαρίδας οὔ φασιν αὐτοὺς ἔχειν.*[u] *Οἵ γε ἄῤῥενες καὶ πολεμικοὶ (κάμηλοι), καὶ ἐκτέμνουσιν αὐτοὺς οἱ Βάκτριοι.*[v] *Λακύδης δὲ καὶ Τίμων οἱ φιλόσοφοι, καὶ τούτους πιεῖν πάμπολύ φασι.*[w] If these examples be not sufficient to give Mr. B. some clearer *apprehension* what it is to solecise in the Attic way, it's to no purpose to add more; but he must still continue *at a loss for the meaning of this deep reflection.*

Well, he recovers himself out of this deep puzzle, and now he *comes to my argument, which,* says he, *I will make free to call* a silly one, *because it is* my own, *and mentioned by me in*

[n] Eustath. ad Iliad. p. 179. [*ed. Basil.*—D.] Σολοικοφανῆ καὶ οὕτω καινοπρεπῆ.
[o] Philost. Apol. p. 155. [p] P. 159. [q] P. 227.
[r] P. 325. [s] Suid. v. Σολοικ. [t] Cor. περὶ Διαλέκτων.
[u] Ælian. de Anim. iv. 50. [v] Ibid. iv. 55.
[w] Var. Hist. ii. 41.

my Preface to Phalaris (p. 35). Indeed, as this *argument* lies in his Preface,[x] being barely hinted there, and neither backed with any proof, nor guarded from any exceptions, and ushered in with a false proposition, *that the Sicilian writers* ALWAYS *used the Doric dialect*, he shall have my consent to call it as *silly* as he pleases. But, with humble submission, as the argument is managed in my *Dissertation*, Mr. B. will find it much easier to *call* it so than to prove it.

I. His first *good reason* why his *Sicilian prince was not obliged to speak Doric*, is, because *he was no native of Sicily* (p. 35). *Which we are sure of*, says he, *if the credit of the* Letters *stand good; and though Dr. B. pretends that he can refute this from better authority, yet he has not throughout his* Dissertation *said one syllable to shake it* (p. 36.); nay, he says, *the Dr. contends, without any manner of proof or reason, that Phalaris was a Sicilian born* (p. 40). Now, though I have as little reason as any body to be concerned for this gentleman's reputation, yet it really afflicts me to see him so pert and positive in a thing that's evidently false. For in the XVI. section of my *Dissertation* I had these very words, *Lucian makes both Phalaris and his smith Perilaus to be born at Agrigentum; but the* Letters *bring one of them from Astypalæa, and the other from Athens.* What can be more express than that Lucian is here produced against the *Letters*, to shew Phalaris was born in Sicily? Yet Mr. B. avers above once, that I have not *one syllable*, not *any manner of proof or reason*, to shew he was a Sicilian. If I did not enter further into that particular, 'twas because I then thought there was no need of it; and, by mentioning Lucian alone, I was as good as my promise, which was only this, *that I might speak perhaps of that by and by.* But since Mr. B. has come forth in such fury to fight Phalaris's battles for him, I shall now think it worth my while to pro-

[x] Neque, cùm Siculis scriptoribus placuerit semper dialectus Dorica, Agrigentinorum . . . . Tyrannus aliâ uti debuit.

duce other authorities, and to shew him, *to his comfort*, that neither all *threatened history*, nor all flattering applauses, *have the luck to live long* (p. 36).

That Phalaris was of Agrigentum, a Sicilian born, we have another positive testimony of Lucian, besides that cited before. *The damned*, says he, *broke out of hell, and were headed by Phalaris the* AGRIGENTINE, *and Busiris the Egyptian, &c.*[y] And so Polyænus calls him *Phalaris the* AGRIGENTINE, *a publican.*[z] And to these we may add Suidas, who says, *Phalaris the* AGRIGENTINE *was Tyrant over all Sicily.*[a] Which Orosius thus expresses, *Phalaris the* SICILIAN *was Tyrant, &c.*[b] And Photius styles him *Phalaris the* AGRIGENTINE *Tyrant.*[c] Are not all these witnesses pretty open and express? and we have others yet that make broad intimation of it. *When Scipio*, says Tully, *restored Phalaris's Bull, which he found at Carthage, to the Agrigentines, he desired them to consider whether it was better for the Sicilians to be slaves to their* OWN *countrymen* (SUIS servire), *or to be subjects to the Romans; when the same Bull was a monument both of their* OWN *cruelty* (DOMESTICÆ crudelitatis) *and of the Roman clemency.*[d] Now, if Phalaris had been a foreigner, this speech of Scipio's had been very weak, and, like the arguments of Mr. B., might have been turned upon the author. Heraclides tells us, that when the Agrigentines got Phalaris into their power, *they burned his mother also and his friends.*[e] Which implies he was not an alien, but had relations in the country, though the *Letters* pretend he was both a stranger and an orphan. This very book, as it seems, of Heraclides, is quoted by Cicero[f] for another story about Phalaris's mother; and if

[y] Lucian. Ver. Hist. ii. p. 761. Φάλαριν τὸν Ἀκραγαντῖνον.

[z] Polyæn. v. Φάλαρις Ἀκραγαντῖνος.

[a] Suid. Φάλ. Ἀκραγαντῖνος.

[b] Oros. i. 20. Phalaris Siculus.

[c] Phot. Ep. 207. Τὸν Ἀκραγαντῖνον τύραννον.

[d] Cic. iv. in Verrem.

[e] Heracl. in Polit. Τὴν μητέρα καὶ τοὺς φίλους.

[f] Cicero. Divin. i.

Heraclides had made Phalaris to be no native of Sicily, we may suppose that Cicero, who had read him, would never put that speech into Scipio's mouth. And what says our Examiner now to his *threatened history?* I am afraid the threats are executed not only upon this piece of history, but upon the whole body of the *Epistles*. For since the *Epistles* give out Phalaris for an Astypalæan, whom all the historians that speak of his lineage declare to be an Agrigentine, 'tis a shrewd token of an imposture; at least it evidently proves thus much, that either none of them ever heard of Phalaris's *Epistles*, or none of them believed them genuine; either of which is sufficient to rout the mock *Sicilian prince*, and all them that take up arms for him.

But Mr. B. is very angry because I was *merry* at a mistake of his, where he calls *Astypalæa a city of Crete* (p. 36.) which I said was a *discovery that no geographer had made before*. He would ask me, he says, *seriously, Do not the* Epistles *themselves* PLAINLY *suppose it? and do not you in the* 58*th page* EXPRESSLY *own that they do so?* Now I, in my turn, desire the favour of asking Mr. B. one of his own questions, *Was it worth his while to forge this little piece of history?* (the remainder of this question to me, *only in order to contradict his* BETTERS (p. 39.), I leave for Mr. B.'s own use, and never will borrow 't of him:) *And is the pleasure of inventing a circumstance,* (again I leave him the words that follow, *merely to be* RUDE *with,*) *an equivalent to the shame of being told on 't?* For in both these particulars he has too well imitated that Sophist whom he has so ill defended. First, the *Epistles* are so far from PLAINLY *supposing* that Astypalæa was in Crete, that they do not suppose it at all. All that is said there is no more than this, *that Phalaris was born at, and banished from, Astypalæa*;[g] and that, some time after, *he invited his wife to come to him from Crete to Agrigentum.*[h] Now, how does this *suppose or imply* that Astypalæa was in Crete? Might not his wife

[g] Ep. 4 and 119. [h] Ep. 69.

leave Astypalæa, where her husband's memory was odious, and retire into Crete? Is it necessary, because* she was in Crete after her husband's banishment, that Astypalæa too must be in Crete? Themistocles was born and lived and married at Athens; but, after he was banished, his wife and children were in Epirus:[1] must Athens, therefore, be in Epirus too? A notable inference! and yet exactly the very same with Mr. B.'s, who, because Phalaris's wife was in Crete, would make Astypalæa in Crete too, though nobody ever heard on 't there. In the second place, he wrongs me, or rather himself, when he says, *I* EXPRESSLY *own that the* Epistles *suppose it.* For the very words he refers to are these; *which* SEEMS *an intimation that the Sophist believed Astypalæa to be a city in Crete.* (Section xv.) Let the candid reader judge now what an adversary I have to deal with. Is a SEEMING *intimation* an equivalent phrase, in his language, to EXPRESS *owning?* If so, I'll have no further controversy with him. I had reason to say it was *seemingly* intimated, because I saw this was the only authority to make an Astypalæa in Crete; an error that nobody could possibly have fallen into, had there been nothing *seeming* here, nothing *like* such an intimation.

But why, says Mr. B., *is not Astypalæa a city in Crete? what has the Dr. to oppose to it? Has he, then, a list of all the* hundred *cities there? If he has, 'tis a mightier discovery in geography than that of mine* (p. 37). And again he inculcates it; *no geographer has mentioned this city in Crete, no more have they several of the other ninety-nine* (p. 38). Now, whether shall we admire more his learning or his reasoning? his learning, that he knew that great secret, that Crete was called Ἑκατόμπολις, because it had a hundred towns in 't; or his reasoning, that Astypalæa is a city of Crete, because I cannot refute it with a list of all the hundred? By the same way of arguing, he may affirm, when the humour takes him, that Oxford too was a city of Crete; and *what will the*

[* In old ed. "*that* because."—D.]

[1] Plut. Them.

Dr. have to oppose to it? But the misfortune is, that the old fatality of mistaking still pursues our Examiner; for what if I should give him *a list of all the hundred cities of Crete?* Then his facetiousness and his assuming air will sit but awkwardly upon him. And yet such a list is so very easy to come at, that above xx. years ago there was one printed to my hand, not only of a hundred, but a hundred and twenty Cretan cities, with an account of the several authors that mention every one of them.[j] For there were a hundred cities there even in Homer's time, and several were founded after. Is not the Examiner, now, a great judge of *discoveries in geography?* Have geographers never spoken of *several of the ninety-nine?* Methinks, as he says, he ought *to have looked about him, before he resolved to be positive* (p. 37).

However, Mr. B. urges, for his own justification, that he was not the first *that made this* (false) *discovery, but mistook after great names, Goltzius and Fazellus* (p. 37). If he thinks it a more venial fault to make a mistake at second-hand after others than to produce one out of his own store, he shall have the benefit of this plea; for I'll be as easy to him as he can desire. 'Tis enough for me that the error is evident, and that Mr. B. slipt into it; but whether he led or followed, it matters not at all. But he goes on again, and expostulates, *Will the Dr. discard all places that occur but once in ancient authors?* (p. 38.); and so he flourishes for a whole page, out of Diodorus and Scylax. But I have answered him already, that Astypalæa of Crete does NOT ONCE *occur in ancient authors.* 'Tis true in some *new* geographers we meet with it, such as Naogeorgus in his Preface to Phalaris, Boyle in his Preface and Index, who, by mistaking the author that they published, have bantered the world with an enchanted city, that nobody can see but they. I must speak *warily*, therefore, as Mr. B. tells me that it occurs in no *old* geographers (p. 38.); and that, I think, I may safely say.

[j] See Meursius's CRETA.

A very worthy person,* having occasion to speak of Phalaris, had said, *he was born at Astypala, an island of the Cyclades.* Which, in the former edition of these *Dissertations,* I had gently corrected thus, *Astypalæa, one of the Sporades.* Upon this, Mr. B. resolves to *do right to that learned man, whom I take upon me,* he says, *to correct, without the least ground or colour of reason* (p. 39). But Mr. B. had been better advised to have staid till that learned man had asked his assistance. I am sure, when that person is on the side of truth, he needs no such defender as Mr. B.; and if he chances to be mistaken (as the most learned may sometimes be), he is too candid and just to accept of such a defender. As, in the present case, I dare say for him, he would be ashamed to make use of such poor shifts as Mr. B. supplies him with. For Mr. B. maintains *Astypala* to be a legitimate word, because we read it *Ἀστυπάλη* in the present copy of Scylax, one of the most corrupted books in the world (p. 40). But the very adjectives formed from the name of this city, *Ἀστυπαλαιεὺς* and *Ἀστυπαλαιάτης*, shew plainly that the primitive name is *Ἀστυπάλαια*: so *Ἰστιαιεὺς* is from *Ἰστίαια*, *Λιλαιεὺς* from *Λίλαια*, *Ποτιδαιεὺς* and *Ποτιδαιάτης* from *Ποτίδαια*. But neither *Ἀστυπαλαιεὺς* nor *Ἀστυπαλαιάτης* can by any analogy be formed from *Ἀστυπάλη*. We must correct Scylax, then, by other authors, and not think to maintain and propagate one fault by another. Well, Mr. B. goes on to confute me for saying, *the Astypalæa in Phalaris seemed to be the island of the Sporades, rather than the Cyclades.* My reason was, because Stephanus, besides that of the Cyclades, names another, *situate between Rhodes and Crete;*[k] which nearness to Crete, whither Phalaris's wife and son are supposed to have fled,[l] makes it probable that that was the island mentioned in the *Epistles.* Now, Mr. B. would overthrow this two several ways: first, the nearness, he says, of this Astypalæa

[* Joshua Barnes, in his ed. of *Euripides*, 1694. p. 523.—D.]

[k] Steph. v. *Ἀστυπ.* [l] Ep. 69.

to Crete is no argument at all, but rather the contrary. *For those that fly are usually glad to get as far as they can out of the reach of their pursuers* (p. 39). Wonderful aphorism and taken from the justest view of human nature! I should have thought, now, that they are usually glad to get *as soon* as they can out of reach. But, hereafter, if a merchantman be chased by a privateer, she must not make to the *next* safe harbour, but, according to Mr. B.'s conduct, bear away for the *remotest*. Mr. B. has been so kind as several times to bid me study the Holy Scripture; I crave leave, therefore, to propose one text to him, and desire his comment upon it. God commanded the Israelites to build three cities of refuge beyond Jordan, and three in the land of Canaan.[m] Did not the persons, therefore, that fled for manslaughter strive to reach the *next* city of refuge? or did they usually cross the river Jordan, and take their course to the city *farthest* from home, that the pursuer might have time and space to overtake them? If Mr. B. can make out this latter to be the true interpretation, he may then persuade us that it was very absurd in Phalaris's wife to steer towards Crete, the nearest place of safety, and that she ought to have *got as far off as she could*, towards Carthage or Hercules's Pillars; no matter whether the season was contrary, or the vessel old and leaky, or not victualled for so long a voyage. But, secondly, says he, *this flight of hers is a mere fiction, and there's no such thing supposed, or in the least intimated, in the* Epistles (p. 39). These are very hard expressions; but we are used to have such from Mr. B. when his arguments are soft enough. Phalaris fled from Astypalæa, and left his family behind him; this is plain from the *Epistles*: and the next news we hear of his wife is that she was in Crete. Now, if Astypalæa was not in Crete, which I have clearly shewed already, then her flight from Astypalæa to Crete is both *supposed* and *intimated*. But indeed, if, with some *new* geographers, one can spy out an Astypalæa in Crete, invi-

[m] Numbers, c. xxxv. v. 14.

sible to all the ancients, then he is well qualified to believe, on Mr. B.'s side, that no flight is supposed. The Examiner closes this first part with a sorry, but yet a very spiteful, quibble about the word *gratuitously*, which is a privileged slander, and cannot with good manners be answered in the manner it deserves. And, to speak freely, I can scarce resent it from Mr. B., because I cannot believe it's his own: I impute it rather to some under-jobbing assistant, of a low sordid spirit, which this calumny is a picture of, than to a gentleman that challenges the title of Honourable.

Before we leave the Examiner's first argument, let us see a little what he drives at in all this bustle about Phalaris's country. Why, to convince us that *his prince* was not obliged to write Doric, he would shew that he was no native of Sicily. Grant this, and let him be born, where the Examiner would have him, at Astypalæa in Crete. Now, we are as sure that the island of Crete spoke Doric, as that Sicily itself did. And is not Mr. B., then, a man of quick thought and foresight, to bring an argument which ends just where it first set out, without advancing one inch? Nay, if Phalaris was born in the island Astypalæa, I had shewn it to be highly probable that Doric was the mother-tongue there; and not a word has been yet said to disprove me. But he may now see a direct testimony of it, which I have added out of Scymnus Chius. So that, upon every supposition, his argument is vain and idle.

II. But we are come at last to the second point; for *supposing* that Phalaris was a Sicilian born, yet Mr. B. will give *good reasons* why he should not use the Doric dialect. If the reader pleases to run over what I had said in my *Dissertation* upon this head, he will see that I myself had given several examples of authors, who, being natives of Sicily or other Dorian countries, had writ books in another dialect, as Diodorus, Empedocles, Philistus, Timæus, Ephorus, Herodotus, Dionysius Hal., &c. But I had shewn the case of Phalaris to be quite different from theirs; and

the difference turned upon these points, that Phalaris's writings are private letters to his domestic servants, about family affairs, never designed to be published, and written at a time when the Attic dialect was not yet in fashion. These, therefore, are the considerations that Mr. B. should have spoken to, if he designed to seek after truth, and not merely to raise a dust. But, instead of answering to the purpose, his main performance here is to fill up my &c., and to add more names of such authors as departed from the dialect of their country. A very easy piece of work, but quite besides the question; and yet it's no little matter of compassion* to see how sorrily he acquits himself, even where to acquit himself well had been a vain and useless labour.

Agathyrsides, says Mr. B., *the historian of Samos, had he followed the dialect of his country, would have written in Doric* (p. 41). Thus it is in his first Edition; for at that time, in his great learning, he thought the Samians spoke Doric. But in the next he corrected it *Ionic;* which I mention for his commendation, and as an instance of his improvement. But 'tis a pity he could go no further; for, if I had the honour to have been in his Assistant's place, I could have told him that there was no such man as Agathyrsides an historian of Samos. Mr. B. will say he is quoted by Stobæus, *Agathyrsidæ Samii in* IV. *rerum Persicarum.*[n] So, indeed, it was in the copy that Gesner made use of; but the true reading is *Agatharchides*, as appears by Plutarch,[o] who relates the same story, word for word, from *Ἀγαθαρχίδης Σάμιος ἐν δευτέρᾳ τῶν Περσικῶν*. Neither can it be said that the error may lie in Plutarch's copies, and not in Stobæus; for the same author is cited twice in Plutarch's book *About Rivers;* but Agathyrsides is never once heard of but in this corrupted place of Stobæus.

Another of Mr. B.'s writers that departed from their

[* The old ed. reads "*comparison:*" an error which has been pointed out by Porson, in his *Tracts, &c. ed. by Kidd*, p. 316.—D.]

[n] Serm. vii. [o] Plut. in Parall. p. 305. [tom. ii. *ed. Xyl.* 1599.—D.]

country dialect is *Andronicus Rhodius, in his Paraphrase of Aristotle's Ethics* (p. 41.): but he should have remembered that the old MS. itself has no name of any author; for Dan. Heinsius, the first editor of it, informs us that Andronicus's name was prefixed to it by a modern and a very unlearned hand. Mr. B. adds, *that we may know Epimenides did not write in the Cretic dialect, from the short citation out of him in St. Paul;*[*]

Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψευσταὶ, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί.

For the Cretans are said to use αἰὲς instead of ἀεί (p. 41). That this poem of Epimenides was not in Cretic, I readily own. But the proof that Mr. B. brings of it does not seem to be good. For the Cretans might use both *αἰὲς* and *ἀεὶ* too. As, in a letter of this very Epimenides, written in the Cretic idiom, extant in Laërtius,[p] we read, *Εἶχε τὰν ἀρχὰν ΑΕΙ*. And in a Cretic inscription among the *Marmora Oxon.*[q] *Οἱ ΤΟΚΑΕΙ κοσμόντες*, that is, *οἱ τόκ' ἀεὶ*. Mr. B., therefore, had he known of it, should rather have cited this following fragment of Epimenides;[r]

Καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ γένος εἰμὶ Σελήνης ἠϋκόμοιο,
Ἣ δεινὸν φρίξασ' ἀπεσείσατο θῆρα λέοντα,
Ἐς Νεμεαῖαν ἄγουσ' αὐτὸν διὰ πότνιαν Ἥραν.

For this passage plainly proves what Mr. B. aims at; that Epimenides's poems were not Cretic, but Iònic. *Ἐς Νεμεαῖαν* is a correction of the learned Gesner's, for the vulgar reading is *Ἐννεμεαῖαν*:† perhaps it might be mended, without varying a letter, *Ἐν Νεμέᾳ ἀνάγουσ'*——

Mr. B. goes on, and tells us, *that Alcæus, Sappho, and Simonides, were born in places where the Ionic was spoken, and yet wrote their lyric poems in Æolic or Doric* (p. 41). 'Tis true, indeed, that Simonides was born at Ceos, *whose*

[* *Ep. ad Tit.* i. 12.—D.]
[† *Ἐννεμεαῖαν· ἄγοις, κ. τ. λ.*—D.]
[p Laërt. Epimen.
[q Marm. Oxon. p. 116.
[r Ælian. H. An. xii. 7. *Τὰ Ἐπιμενίδου ἔπη.*

inhabitants were Ionians, being an Athenian colony,[s] as Herodotus tells us; for the Athenians themselves were anciently Ionians. Mr. B., therefore, has the luck to be right in one of the three. But for the other two, Alcæus and Sappho, how scandalously is he mistaken! I protest I am ashamed even to refute such miserable trash; though Mr. B. was not ashamed to write it, nay, to value himself upon it. What part is it that I must teach him? That Alcæus and Sappho were natives of Lesbos? but 'tis almost incredible he should be ignorant of that. Or that the language of Lesbos was Æolic? yes, there his wonderful learning was at a loss, and he believed it was Ionic. But his Scylax, that he lately vapoured with (if, instead of a wrong word, Ἀστυπάλη, he had learned any good out of him), might have taught him a better lesson; *Lesbos*, says Scylax,[t] *an* ÆOLIAN *island. The inhabitants of Lesbos*, says Stephanus,[u] *are called* ÆOLIANS. *Five* ÆOLIAN *cities*, says Herodotus,[v] *are in the island of Lesbos.* Nay, it was the metropolis, as it were, of all the Æolian cities, as Strabo[w] says expressly; Σχεδὸν δέ τι καὶ μητρόπολις ἡ Λέσβος ὑπάρχει τῶν Αἰολίδων* πόλεων. But there's a passage in Ælian[x] and Suidas[y] that may seem to countenance our Examiner's mistake; for, in reckoning up the Ionian cities, they have Πριήνη, ΛΕΣΒΟΣ, Τέως. Though the misfortune is, that for Λέσβος we must read it there ΛΕΒΕΔΟΣ, as it's plain from Herodotus, Strabo, and others. I had corrected this, when I knew not that any other had done it. But it was well for me, that, before I printed it, I lit on Meursius's *Fortuna Attica*, where I found the same correction. For if Mr. B. had met with the same passage, when he next appears in print, I had been branded for a plagiary. And yet I do not believe Meursius was a plagiary, though I find that, long before his time, this very

[s] Herod. viii. c. 46. Χῖοι [Κεῖοι.—D.] .... ἔθνος ἐὸν Ἰωνικὸν ἀπὸ Ἀθηναίων.

[t] Scylax, p. 34. Νῆσος Αἰολὶς Λέσβος.

[u] Steph. v. Αἰολ.

[v] Herod. i. c. 151.

[w] Strabo, p. 616.

[* Vulgò Αἰολικῶν: vide *ed. Falc.* p. 885.—D.]

[x] Æl. Var. Hist. viii. 5.

[y] Suid. v. Ἰωνία.

same emendation, and by the same proofs, was made by Brodæus, in his notes upon *Anthol. Epigram.*[z] For a man would have very hard measure, if, because another, whom he knew not of, had lit upon the same thought, he must be traduced as a plagiary: though it appear from the rest of his performances (which are certainly new and his own), that he was very able to do that too, without stealing from others. And this alone will be a sufficient answer to that calumny of Mr. B.'s, which by and by we shall come to.

The Examiner, in the depth of his reading, goes from writers to *coins* that have been struck in *Dorian countries, and yet the inscription of them not pure Doric* (p. 44). Among others, he tells us of Ξυστάρχης ἱεροῦ ἀγῶνος, *a Cretan money*. This was borrowed from Monsieur Harduin's very excellent book *Of the Coins of Cities and People:* but I find other persons, as well as myself, have but ill usage from Mr. B. when he *borrows* any thing of them. For there is no such Cretan money, neither does Harduin give the least intimation of it. There's an inscription, indeed, but no *money*, that has Ξυστάρχης ἱεροῦ ἀγῶνος,[a] and 'tis extant in Gruter, p. 1094., belonging to Lyttus, a city of Crete. And 'tis with equal faithfulness and diligence, what Mr. B. presently adds, *that in some other inscriptions it is* Ξυστάρχας. This is the reverse of the former blunder: for his author Harduin here says money, and not *inscription;* and he says Κρητάρχας, not Ξυστάρχας; which last word, in the Doric termination, Mr. B. will not find either in inscription or money. I will leave the credit of this citation to be divided between Mr. B. and his Assistant; for it's a plain case that one or both of them have an excellent hand at transcribing of authors. But, besides this, Mr. B. mentions ΤΕΛΗ, *the inscription of a coin belonging to Velia, a town in Magna Græcia;* which Velia he supposes, in his great learning, to have been a Dorian colony; but Herodotus and Strabo will

[z] Lib. iv. cap. Εἰς Ναούς.
[a] Harduin, Num. Illustr. p. 261.

tell him that it was an Ionic, and the planters were the Phocæans, who were driven out of Asia by Harpagus.

But the most remarkable instance of all, says Mr. B., is *that of Zaleucus, king of the Locrians, a Doric colony, the Preface to whose Laws is preserved in Stobæus and Diodorus and has plainly nothing of the Doric dialect in it* (p. 41). And again, a little after; *I will add,* says he, *Zaleucus too, who, we are sure, was a Pythagorean, from very good authority* (p. 53). And I am *sure* too that this is a *remarkable instance,* though not the *most of all,* of Mr. B.'s great abilities in all parts of learning. For he has turned the commonwealth of the Locrians into a monarchy, and of a poor shepherd and slave, as Zaleucus is said to have been, he has made a KING. These are no ordinary performances, and they shew the gentleman has well improved himself in Phalaris's service. But why, forsooth, must Zaleucus be a *king*? Merely because Mr. B. had heard he was a lawgiver. And if it chance to lie in his way, he will make Draco and Solon *kings* of Athens, by the very same argument; though Aristotle informs us, that the *best* and *most* of the law-makers were *men of the middle rank.*[b] But, to pass over this scandalous mistake, I have a matter of greater consequence to debate with him; for I am persuaded (notwithstanding Mr. B.'s *very good authority,*) that Zaleucus was no Pythagorean; and that the system of laws ascribed to him, and produced by Diodorus and others, may be as mere an imposture as Phalaris's *Epistles.*

The title of that book, as Stobæus and others quote it, was ZALEUCUS's *Laws;* but we have good reason to suspect that there was no such person as Zaleucus a lawgiver; and if this be true, the cheat is apparent. Timæus the Sicilian, a man of a virulent style, but an inquisitive and accurate writer, expressly maintained, against the common tradition of his time, that there was no such man as Zaleucus. Cicero, in a letter to Atticus,[c] among other vulgar errors, takes notice

[b] Arist. Polit. iv. 11. Τῶν μέσων πολιτῶν.

[c] Lib. vi. Ep. 1. A Timæo tuo familiari.

of this; *Who has not said,* says he, *that Zaleucus was law-giver to the Locrians? Must Theophrastus therefore be despised, if that story be refuted by Timæus, an author you are much versed in?* And again, in his book *Of Laws; Before I give you the law itself,* says he,[d] *I will preface something in its commendation, as I see Zaleucus and Charondas have done.* To which his brother Quintus replies, *that Timæus denied there was any such person as Zaleucus. But Theophrastus,* says Cicero again, (*an author, as I think, no worse than Timæus, as many think, a better,*) *affirms there was such a man; and the Locrians, my clients, have still a tradition of it: but whether there was such a man or no, it's nothing to this matter.* Here we see the orator, in compliment, as it seems, to his Locrian clients, speaks in favour of the vulgar tradition; but in his private letter to Atticus he gives it up as a fable, and joins it with that notorious error about Eupolis's being drowned Olymp. XCI. 2., which, he says, Eratosthenes refuted, shewing several comedies that Eupolis made and exhibited after that year. As for Cicero's Locrians, who, he says, still preserved the tradition about Zaleucus, we may oppose to them some Locrians in Timæus's time, who lived above CC. years before Cicero. For Timæus, in that very place of his History[e] where he reprehended Aristotle and Theophrastus for their narratives about the Locrians, said he conversed with one Echecrates, a Locrian of note and quality, and had his informations from him about the affairs of that city. If Echecrates, therefore, in that age did not believe there was any Zaleucus, he's certainly as credible as Cicero's Locrians, who come so many generations afterwards, after so many revolutions and changes in the constitution of their government. 'Tis true Polybius falls very foul upon Timæus for abusing Aristotle and Theophrastus, and charges him with some falsehoods relating to the Locrians; but there's nothing now extant implying that Polybius defended Theophrastus against him in this particular of Zaleucus. There's

[d] De Legibus, ii. 6.

[e] See Excerpta ex Polyb. p. 45, &c.

a passage, indeed, in the *Excerpta* of Polybius,[f] where a law of Zaleucus is mentioned; but the word φησὶ there intimates that he gives it not as his own narrative, but repeats the words of somebody else. But, however, let that be as it will, *whether there was such a man or no*, as Cicero says, I will not contend; but I think so much may be safely concluded from it, that either this book of ZALEUCUS'S LAWS was not yet made in Timæus's time, or else he condemned it for an imposture; nay, not he only, but Echecrates, a citizen of Locri, and therefore a very competent judge about a story of that country.*

But I rather think the book was made after the days of Timæus; for I observe that those that speak of Zaleucus before and at that time make him a poor shepherd, and much older than Pythagoras; but after that time they commonly describe him as a man of quality,[g] and a scholar of that philosopher's. Now, this new account of him was in all probability gathered from some passages in that *System of Laws* ascribed to him; for where else could they meet with it? So that if I can shew, from the oldest and best writers, that he was more ancient than Pythagoras, this new and false story in the later authors, being taken from that system, will convict it of a cheat.

The account that Aristotle gave of him is this; *that when the Locrians had consulted the oracle, how they might be rid of their seditions, they were bid to make themselves laws. Upon this, a certain shepherd, named Zaleucus, told them, that he could furnish them with very good laws. And being*

[f] Polyb. xii. p. 660.

[* Against this opinion, see Fabric. Biblioth. Gr. l. ii. c. xiv., and Warburton, Div. Leg. of Moses, vol. i. book ii. § 3., where the learned Bishop seems to be quite right in preferring Vizzanius' interpretation of Jamblichus to the Doctor's, &c. &c. &c. SALTER, *note on ed.* 1777.—"The Bishop has entered "the lists with the tremendous Bentley, who treated the laws of Zaleucus and "Charondas as the forgeries of a Sophist. A whole section of mistakes or mis-"representations is devoted to this controversy: but Bentley is no more, and "Warburton may sleep in peace." *Crit. Obs. on the Sixth Book of the Æneid*, GIBBON'S *Miscel. Works*, II. 499. 4to.—D.]

[g] Diod. Sic. p. 84. Εὐγενής.

asked, whence he could have them? he said, Minerva appeared to him in a dream, and would give him them. Whereupon they gave him his freedom (for he was then a slave), and so he became their lawgiver.[h] And agreeably to this, Suidas tells us, *that at first he was a slave and a shepherd.*[i] Either of which circumstances are sufficient proofs that he was no Pythagorean; for if he was another man's slave, and obliged to look after sheep at Locri, how could he have either time or leave to be at Crotona with Pythagoras, near a hundred mile[s] from home, and especially to continue there the v. years of silence, according to the discipline of the school? Besides, a slave would not have been admitted into that society, had he had never such opportunities.

And we have another argument, from the same passage of Aristotle, that Zaleucus was no scholar of Pythagoras. *For he ascribed all his laws to Minerva, from whom he pretended to receive them in dreams.* This Aristotle has told us, as he is cited by the Scholiast on Pindar. And that we may not question the Scholiast's authority, the great Clemens Alex. assures us, that both Aristotle and his scholar Chamæleo say, *that Zaleucus gave it out that he had his laws from Minerva.*[j] Plutarch too falls in with this account, where he tells us, *that Zaleucus said, Minerva used to appear to him, and give him laws, which were all entirely hers, and no part of them his own.*[k] Now, I humbly conceive that this project of Zaleucus's has nothing of a Pythagorean in it. For Pythagoras's scholars ascribed every thing to their master; it was always *Αὐτὸς ἔφα* with them, HE SAID IT; and the greatest oath was to swear by him,

*Οὐ μὰ τὸν ἀμετέρᾳ ψυχᾷ παραδόντα τετρακτύν.**

[h] Pind. Schol. ad x. Olymp. *Φησὶν Ἀριστοτέλης*, &c.

[i] Suid. v. Ζαλ. *Ἦν δὲ πρότερον δοῦλός τε καὶ ποιμήν.*

[j] Clem. Strom. i. p. 152.

[k] Plutarch. *περὶ τοῦ ἑαυτὸν*, &c. Idem in Numâ. Valer. Max. i. 2. Theodoret. ad Græc. Serm. ix.

[* *Pythag. Aur. Carm.* v. 47.—*Poëtæ Min. Gr.* I. 484. *ed. Gaisf.*, where *καὶ μὰ τὸν*, κ. τ. λ.—D.]

If Zaleucus, therefore, had been of that society, he would certainly have honoured his master by imputing his laws to his instructions; but, being a poor illiterate shepherd, and of no authority with the people, he very craftily acquired it by taking nothing upon himself, but laying all to Minerva.

Again, Strabo informs us, *that the Locrians were generally believed to be the first that used* WRITTEN *laws;*[l] *and that Zaleucus took them, as Ephorus the historian says, from the Cretic, and the Laconic, and the Areopagetic customs.*[m] And so Scymnus Chius, speaking of these Locrians, says, *they were the first that had* WRITTEN *laws, which were supposed to be made by Zaleucus;*

> *Τούτους δὲ πρώτους φασὶ χρήσασθαι νόμοις*
> *Γραπτοῖσιν, οὓς Ζάλευκος ὑποθέσθαι δοκεῖ.*[n]

Clemens Alexand.[o] forgot himself, perhaps, when he said, *that Zaleucus the Locrian was the first that made laws;* for he ought to have said, *made* WRITTEN *laws*, as Ephorus and Strabo said before him. But if Zaleucus's written laws were the most ancient, 'tis most certain he could not be a Pythagorean. For Draco's laws were *written*[p] ones at Athens; and he lived about Olymp. XXXIX., as Tatian, Clemens, and Eusebius expressly say; or as Diodorus, in one of his lost books, *he was* XLVII. *years before Solon:*[q] which, being reckoned from Solon's archonship, Olymp. XLVI. 3., will fall upon Olymp. XXXV. 1. If Zaleucus, then, was before Draco, he must be longer before Pythagoras, who, by the very earliest account, was not born till Olymp. XLIII. 4.

All this is further confirmed by Eusebius, who places *Zaleucus, the celebrated lawgiver of the Locrians, at Olymp.* XXIX., which is XL. years before Draco, and about LX. before

[l] Strabo, p. 259. *Νόμοις ἐγγραπτοῖς.*

[m] *Νομίμων*, i. e. *ἐγγράφων.*

[n] Scymnus, v. 313. [p. 19. *G. V. Ox.* ii.—D.]

[o] Clem. Strom. i. p. 133.

[p] Joseph. c. Apion. i. p. 2. *Γραφέντας νόμους.*

[q] Ulpian. in Demost. Timocr. p. 480. *Ὁ δὲ Δράκων πρὸ Σόλωνος ἐτῶν καὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἔτεσιν, ὥς φησιν ὁ Διόδωρος.*

Pythagoras was born. Aristotle, indeed, reprehends their ignorance *who would make Onomacritus to have been the first that was skilled in law-making; and that Thales was his acquaintance; whose scholars were Lycurgus and* ZALEUCUS, *and Zaleucus's scholar was Charondas: for they talk*, says he, *inconsistently with chronology.*[r] The Thales that is meant here was not the Milesian, but the ancient Cretan, who is generally assigned as a master to Lycurgus.[s] So that Aristotle seems to find fault that they made Zaleucus too a scholar of that Thales. For at that rate he must have lived CVIII. years before the first Olympiad,[t] *i. e.* CC. years before Locri was built, Ol. XXIV.[u] How, then, could he be a Locrian, and a lawgiver there? This is the *ignorance of chronology* which the philosopher censures here: but, however, it's no inconsiderable argument that Zaleucus was older than Pythagoras, who came above CCC. years after Lycurgus.

And we have yet a further discovery of it from the orator Demosthenes, who, to persuade the Athenians not to change any law upon small and frivolous pretences, gives the example of these Locrians, *with whom*, says he, *it's a law, that a man who shall propose to make any new law shall do it with a rope about his neck, which he shall be strangled in, if he do not carry his point: which has been such a guard and defence to the laws, that there has been but one new one made in* MORE THAN TWO HUNDRED YEARS.[v] Now, that Demosthenes here speaks of Zaleucus's laws is plain enough from his naming the Locrians; but it appears further from the law itself. For Hierocles and Polybius's author say expressly, *that this law about the rope was* ZALEUCUS'S;[w]

[r] Arist. Polit. ii. 58. Ἀσκεπτότερον τῷ χρόνῳ λέγοντες. [cap. ix. *ed. Schn.*, where τῶν χρόνων.—D.]

[s] Strabo, p. 482. Sextus Empir. p. 68. Laërt. in Thal.

[t] Clemens, Plutarch, &c.

[u] Euseb., Strabo.

[v] Demost. in Timocr. p. 469. Ἐν πλείοσιν ἢ διακοσίοις ἔτεσιν.

[w] Hieroc. apud Stobæum, Serm. 37. Polyb. xii. p. 661.

and it's produced by Stobæus,[x] as out of Zaleucus's own Preface to his body of laws. 'Tis not very clear, indeed, what the orator means here; whether it was *more than* CC. *years* from the first date of Zaleucus's laws to the introducing of that one new law; or whether from the first date of them to the orator's own time, which he calls *more than* CC. *years*, there was but one new law made. The first interpretation seems the more probable; but even the latter will be a sufficient proof that Zaleucus could not be Pythagoras's scholar. For this oration against Timocrates was spoken Olymp. CVI. 4., when Theodemus or Eudemus was archon, as Dionysius Halic.[y] says in express words; and Plutarch[z] says it implicitly, when he tells us Demosthenes made it at the XXVII. or XXVIII. year of his age. For he was *born* at Olymp. XCIX. 4.,[a] and his XXVIII. year falls at Olymp. CVI. 4. Now, to compute only *two hundred* years backwards from this Olympiad, and it reaches to Olymp. LVI. 4.; when Pythagoras, by the very earliest reckoning, had been but XIII. years in Italy, and VII. of those were spent in his room under-ground; and I suppose what Demosthenes calls MORE than CC. years will amount above the remaining five, nay, I may moderately say, above the whole XIII. But thus much, I am sure, may be safely concluded from it, that if Zaleucus was really Pythagoras's disciple, the learned Mr. Dodwell's calculation must be wrong, which makes Pythagoras first set foot in Italy at Olymp. LXVII. 2., for that Olympiad falls XLII. years within Demosthenes's two hundred, without adding those years to the account which the orator means by MORE. I make the reckoning from Pythagoras's *going to* Italy, because Zaleucus, one of the Locrians of Italy, could not be his scholar till he came thither. For Theodoret was quite out when he thought the Locrians, whom Zaleucus gave laws to, were those of Greece, near Acarnania and Phocis.[b]

[x] Stob. Serm. 42. [y] Dion. Hal. de Demost. [z] Plut. Vitâ Demost.
[a] Dionys. ibid. [b] Theod. c. Græc. Serm. ix.

Take all these arguments together, and I conceive their united force will effectually refute Mr. B., *who is sure that Zaleucus was a Pythagorean* (p. 53). But, besides that, they will go a considerable way to refute the book itself too, which passed abroad in the world under the name of Zaleucus. For if any intimation was given in that book that the author was a Pythagorean, the imposture of it is very evident. And yet it's hard to give any other reason that should induce the later writers to call him a Pythagorean, as Diodorus does expressly, *μαθητὴς Πυθαγόρου τοῦ φιλοσόφου, the scholar of Pythagoras the philosopher*;[c] and so Laërtius, Porphyry, and Jamblichus; and Seneca thus flourishes upon it, *that Zaleucus and Charondas learnt their laws in the silent and sacred recess of Pythagoras.*[d] Thus, we see, the more recent authors with one voice make him a Pythagorean; and yet every one of the old, that speak of him, make him earlier than that philosopher, as Ephorus, Demosthenes, Aristotle, Chamæleo, Theophrastus, Timæus, the youngest of whom was about CCL. years before the eldest of the others. What can be the cause of this difference, but that, in the interval between these old and those later writers, in the times of the Ptolemies, when the forging of books came to be a fashion and a trade, some impostor made a system of laws under the name of Zaleucus, and in it gave a broad hint that he was a scholar of Pythagoras?

The impostor had taken care to insert those laws of Zaleucus which he had met with in ancient writers into his counterfeit system. As that law which Demosthenes mentions, *that he that proposed a new law should do it with a halter about his neck*, appears in the very Preface of the counterfeit book which Stobæus has given us.[e] And his forgery met with good entertainment, because the old constitution of the city Locri was then altered, and was no longer in being to discover the cheat; which imposed, therefore, upon Diodorus and others, and prevailed upon Cicero

[c] Diod. Sic. p. 84. [d] Sen. Ep. 90. [e] Stob. Serm. 42.

himself so far, that he seems to stand neuter, and pronounces on no side. For it appears there that Cicero means this very Preface that Stobæus afterwards met with. *Before I give you the law itself*, says he, *I'll preface something in commendation of it, as I see Zaleucus and Charondas have done.*[f] And he gives a *proœmium*, as he calls it, much to the same sense with those of Zaleucus and Charondas in Stobæus. But, however, this impostor has not done every thing so artificially, but that, even from the fragments that are still left of his book, it may seem very questionable if it was not supposititious.

I. Demosthenes has informed us, *that the new law, which alone was made at Locri in the compass of above* [illegible] *years, was, that he that blinded a man with one eye should lose both his own;* for the old law of Zaleucus was *lex talionis, an eye for an eye.* But Diodorus makes this to be one of the laws of Charondas, and tells the same story about *a man with one eye* at Thurii, and that the laws there, which had continued the same a long time, were never changed but upon this and two other occasions. They are both very good authors, and 'tis a very tender point to say whether of them we should follow. But, with submission to better judgments, I will lay down some reasons why I think Demosthenes is in the right here. He calls the city where he says this law was so long in force πόλις ΕΥΝΟΜΟΥΜΕΝΗ, *a well-governed city*;[g] and this is the very character that is generally given of Locri. *The Locrians*, says Strabo, *were* πλεῖστον χρόνον ΕΥΝΟΜΗΘΕΝΤΕΣ, *for a long time under good government.*[h] And Pindar puts this compliment upon them,

Νέμει γὰρ Ἀτρέκεια πόλιν Λοκρῶν Ζεφυρίων[i]—

Where he means, says the Scholiast, ὅτι ΕΥΝΟΜΕΙΤΑΙ,

[f] Cic. de Leg. ii. 6.
[g] Demosth. c. Timocr. p. 468.
[h] Strabo, p. 259.
[i] Pind. Olymp. x. [v. 17. *ed. Heyn.*, where Ζεφ. begins the next line.—*D.*]

that they have a good government. And Plato tells us, *that the Locrians seem to have been εὐνομώτατοι, the best-governed people in all that country:*[j] and again he says, *that Timæus was of Locri, εὐνομωτάτης πόλεως, the best-regulated city in Italy;*[k] which Proclus thus explains, *that the Locrians εὐνομοῦντο, were well governed, is evident, for their law-maker was Zaleucus.*[l] But, on the contrary, the Thurians, where Diodorus lays the scene of this story, were so far from being celebrated on this account, that they are censured for their misgovernment. So, Ephorus complains of them in Strabo;[m] and Aristotle in his *Politics* brings them in twice as examples of ill management.[n] Demosthenes's story, therefore, is more agreeable to this matter of fact than that of Diodorus is. And again, Demosthenes says here that the Locrians were under a happy government *above* CC. *years;* as Strabo also says, *πλεῖστον χρόνον, a very long time;*[o] which is really true in fact, as appears by a computation from the date of Zaleucus's laws to the time that Dionysius the younger tyrannised there, and ruined all, at Olymp. CVI. 1. Now, Diodorus too would magnify the continuance of Charondas's laws at Thurii, when he says, *ἐν παντὶ τῷ μετὰ ταῦτα χρόνῳ, in* ALL *the time after Charondas there were but three changes made in them.*[p] But this account of a long continuance is not warranted by history; for it's certain, from himself and others,[q] that the city Thurii was but first built Olymp. LXXXIV. 1., or a little before; and the government was quite subverted within LIV. years, at Olymp. XCVII. 3., three parts in four of the people being slain, and the rest sold for slaves, by their neighbours the Lucanians.[r] Upon the whole, then, Demosthenes's account seems more agreeable to truth. But how happened it that Diodorus should be so mistaken, and ascribe a law to Cha-

[j] Plato, Leg. i. p. 17.
[k] Idem, Timæo.
[l] Proclus ad Tim. p. 22.
[m] Strabo, p. 260.
[n] Arist. Pol. v. 7.
[o] Strab. ibid.
[p] Diod. p. 82.
[q] Diod. p. 75. Plutarch. Vi. Lysiæ, &c.
[r] Diod. p. 313. Strabo, p. 263.

rondas which we see was Zaleucus's? Is there not just ground of suspicion that Diodorus was imposed on by the spurious book of Zaleucus's laws, where this law was forgotten by the impostor? If so, it will open a discovery of another counterfeit; for we see the law was omitted where it ought to have been entered, and it was put among Charondas's, where it ought not to have been. That copy, therefore, of Charondas's laws must, by this account, be a cheat too, and by the very same hand. For, as it seems, the impostor had read something about the law, but was mistaken in fathering it upon a wrong person. But of Charondas's laws I shall say more anon. This must needs seem the most probable account of Diodorus's error, if we believe he has truly told us what he found in those books of laws, and did not forget himself. But there's some reason to suspect that he trusted to his memory, and so might possibly mistake one lawgiver for the other. For he tells us, too, that the law concerning *the halter* was one of Charondas's, which Stobæus[t] attributes to Zaleucus, and pretends to cite it in Zaleucus's own words out of his Preface. Hierocles too and Polybius's author ascribe it to Zaleucus;[u] but they might have it at second-hand. So that all this matter must lie between Diodorus and Stobæus. If Diodorus has quoted faithfully, Zaleucus's book of laws were a cheat: *if Stobæus* was a faithful transcriber, then this argument fails against Zaleucus's book, and falls upon Diodorus himself.

II. We have two words of those laws of Zaleucus preserved in Hesychius; *ΛΕΠΤΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΧΕΙΑΣ*, says he, λεῦκος ἐν νόμοις, τὰς δραχμάς· λεπτὰς μὲν τὰς ἑξωβόλους, παχείας δὲ τὰς πλέον ἐχούσας; that is, *the words* λεπτὰς καὶ παχείας, thin *and* thick, *in the laws of Zaleucus, are spoken of* drachms; *the thin drachms weighing six oboli, and the thick above six.* In the printed Hesychius it's λεῦκος;

[t] Diod. p. 82. [t] Stob. Serm. 42.
[u] Hierocl. apud Stob. 37. Polyb. p. 661.

but Salmasius, Gronovius, and other learned men, have observed, and the thing itself speaks, that the true reading is *Ζάλευκος*; for, the preceding word ending in *ΑΣ*, the following *ΖΑ* was swallowed up, as it frequently happens when syllables are alike. Now, I say, if *λεπτὰς καὶ παχείας*, *thin and thick drachms*, were in the laws of Zaleucus, as Hesychius assures us, that pretended book of laws must appear a mere cheat. For Julius Pollux informs us who they were that called those drachms *παχείας*, *thick* ones, and upon what occasion. *Τὴν Αἰγιναίαν δραχμὴν*, says he, *μείζω τῆς Ἀττικῆς οὖσαν* (*δέκα γὰρ ὀβολοὺς Ἀττικοὺς ἴσχυεν*), *οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ΠΑΧΕΙΑΝ δραχμὴν ἐκάλουν, μίσει τῶν Αἰγινητῶν Αἰγιναίαν ὀνομάσαι μὴ θέλοντες*; i. e. *the Æginean drachm, which was bigger than the Attic* (*for it weighed* x. *Attic oboli*), *was called by the Athenians ΠΑΧΕΙΑ*, the thick drachm; *for they would not call it* the Æginean, *out of hatred to that people.*[v] The case is this; the Attic drachm weighed six Attic oboli, and so the Æginean drachm weighed six Æginean oboli; but the Æginean obolus was bigger than the Attic, in the proportion of x. to vi.; and so consequently the Æginean drachm, and the sums made up of it, the mine and talent, exceeded the Attic drachm, mine, and talent, in the same proportion. Now, the Æginean drachm being often current at Athens (for Ægina is close by it), and in other places of trade, the Athenians, who mortally hated the Ægineans, would not call that money *Æginean*, as the rest of the world did, but *thick*, because it was thicker than their own, weighing almost twice as much. The whole history of this enmity between the Athenians and Ægineans is given largely by Herodotus.[w] If *ΠΑΧΕΙΑ*, then, for an Æginean drachm was a word peculiar to the Attics, and proceeded purely from the hatred between the two nations, how comes the word, in that sense, to be found in Zaleucus's laws? What had the Ægineans offended him, who lived at Locri in Italy, remote enough from them and their quarrels?

[v] Pollux, ix. 6. [p. 1049. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

[w] Herod. lib. v. and vi.

Why did not he call it *Æginean*, as all the world did, except the Athenians? Nay, even among the Athenians themselves they seem to have been the tradesmen and rabble only that called them *παχείας*, and not the men of quality; as appears plainly from Thucydides, where we have *ΑΙΓΙΝΑΙΟΣ ὀβολὸς*, *ΑΙΓΙΝΑΙΑ δραχμὴ*, *ΑΙΓΙΝΑΙΟΝ τάλαντον*, but never *ΠΑΧΥΣ ὀβολὸς*, nor *ΠΑΧΕΙΑ δραχμὴ*. And would Zaleucus put a word in his laws which a grave writer would not use in his history? But why must the Æginean money be at all taken notice of by Zaleucus? What was the Locrian commonwealth concerned with the Ægineans? They were very far asunder, and the latter were poor and inconsiderable in the time of that lawgiver, and consequently could have very little or no traffic with his citizens. Thucydides tells us,[x] that before Themistocles's time neither the Ægineans nor Athenians were considerable at sea; and Herodotus says,[y] that the beginning of the wealth and power of Ægina was the plunder that was carried thither and sold after Xerxes's army was routed at Platæa. There was no reason, then, nor occasion to bring the Æginean money into the body of his laws, much less to speak of it under the nickname of *παχείας*, which the Locrians could not know the meaning of, till it were explained to them out of Greece. Nay, there's reason to suspect that Zaleucus's true laws were made before the hatred began between the Athenians and Ægineans, and consequently before *παχεῖα δραχμὴ* was ever used in that sense. Herodotus relates the first original of that hatred, which was about a couple of statues; and the occasion of his mentioning it is this. About Olymp. LXIX. the Thebans desired the assistance of the Ægineans in a war against Athens; and the Ægineans, says he, *remembering the quarrel about the statues*,[z] were ready enough to enter into an alliance against the Athenians. Now, from Olymp. LXIX. to the time of Zaleucus, Olymp.

[x] Thucyd. p. 11.
[y] Herod. ix. 79.
[z] Herod. v. 89.

XXIX., there are no fewer than CLX. years; and if the business of the statues were as long ago as that, 'twas a very stale and cold pretence to begin a new war upon. Surely, if they had been at enmity for eightscore years, in all that tract of time some skirmishes or pickeerings would have happened between them, that might serve for a fresher complaint, and a greater incentive to war, than an old scuffle six generations ago. 'Tis very probable, therefore, that Zaleucus had made his laws before the quarrel began which gave rise to the expression, *παχεῖα δραχμή*. Add to all this, that among the Dorian Greeks of Sicily and Italy, and consequently among the Locrians, there was no such sort of money as *δραχμὴ* or *ὀβολὸς*; but their species were quite different both in value and name, *οὐγκία, νοῦμμος, λίτρα*, as I'll shew further in Section XIV. And if this be made out, who will question but these pretended laws must be spurious? For if the name and species of *δραχμὴ* was quite foreign to the Locrians, what had *λεπτὰς καὶ παχείας* to do there? One might as well expect to find them in the XII. Tables at Rome as in the laws at Locri. 'Tis most probable, then, that some Sophist drew them up, and, having been bred among the Athenians, he was senseless enough to put such words into the mouth of Zaleucus as he heard spoken at Athens: just as the forger of Phalaris's *Letters* has made the Tyrant talk Attic, as if he had quite forgot he was a Sicilian.

III. Diodorus[a] tells us, one of Zaleucus's laws was, *that nobody should wear cloths as fine as Milesian cloths, if he was not a catamite, μηδὲ ἱμάτιον ΙΣΟΜΙΛΗΣΙΟΝ (φορεῖν), ἐὰν μὴ ἑταιρεύηται.* Now, methinks it is very oddly worded in a Locrian law, to characterise the cloths for men's habits by comparing them with the manufacture of Miletus in Asia, at so vast a distance from Italy. For, considering the remoteness of the places, and the smallness of trade in those early

[a] Diod. p. 85.

times, it may justly be questioned whether the Milesian cloths, though in Greece they were celebrated for their fineness, were at all heard of at Locri, much less were so famous there as to deserve to come into their laws. And besides this, the word *ἰσομιλήσιον, i. e.* EQUAL *to Milesian* cloth, never found that I know of but here, seems a very unfit expression for a law. For how many doubts and questions would arise about that *equality!* and what a wide door was opened to delators and sycophants! If he had absolutely forbid the wearing of Milesian cloths, the law had been clear, and had amounted to a prohibition of importing the commodity. But as it is *ἰσομιλήσιον*, and not *Μιλήσιον*, it seems to be contrived on purpose for the encouragement of barrators. Nay, though he had forbidden Milesian cloths, even that too had been very improper; for to what purpose should he declare by law such goods to be contraband, which even before that prohibition were never imported? For the Locrians might have as fine or finer cloths, and at a much lower rate, from their next neighbours, the Apulians, and Calabrians, and particularly from Tarentum, than the Milesians could bring them. To be sure, then, the Milesians would never carry cloths, with the charge and hazard of so long a voyage, to a market where others could both out-do them and under-sell them. Such a trade would have been as unprofitable as to carry silphium to Cyrene, or frankincense to Arabia. *The best wool,* says Pliny,[b] *is the Apulian; and what in Italy is called the wool of the Greek cattle, but abroad is called Italic; in the third place comes the Milesian.* By the Greek cattle Pliny means the Tarentine, as Columella explains it, *Græcum pecus, quod plerique Tarentinum vocant.*[c] *The finest sheep,* says the same Columella, *are the Milesian, the Calabrian, and Apulian, and among these the Tarentine are the best.*[d] And the Tarentines were as famous for the effeminateness of their habit as the Milesians themselves. *All the Tarentines,* says Clearchus, *wore*

[b] Plin. viii. 48. [c] Columella, vii. 4. [d] vii. 2.

fine and transparent cloths, such as women wear now-a-days.[e] Insomuch that a sort of thin woman's garment had its name from them, ταραντίνιον, as we read in Athenæus:[f] but in that place, a MS. Athenæus, and the MS. Epitome, both of them in his Majesty's Library, have it ταραντῖνον, which may seem the better reading; though Eustathius[g] seems to have found neither of them in his copy, but ταραντινίδιον. In all probability, then, had the true Zaleucus designed to restrain the luxury of apparel, he would rather take notice of his next neighbours, the Tarentines, whom all the Locrians knew, than of the Milesians, whom few of them had so much as heard of; and instead of ἰσομιλήσιον, he would say ἰσοταραντῖνον.* But the counterfeit Zaleucus, being a Grecian Sophist, and knowing that the Milesian cloths had the greatest vogue in the Greek markets, was so discreet as to forbid them by name in a body of laws which he cut out for Italy.

IV. The pretended Preface of Zaleucus, which Stobæus has described word for word, begins with this sentence; *Every member of a commonwealth in the first place ought to believe there are gods, ἀναβλέποντας εἰς οὐρανὸν καὶ τὸν ΚΟΣΜΟΝ, καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς διακόσμησιν καὶ ΤΑΞΙΝ, which they will know by looking up to heaven and the world, and considering the beauty and order there.* Now, I presume I have proved already, beyond all reasonable exception, that Zaleucus lived some generations before Pythagoras's time; and if so, this Preface cannot possibly be his, because Pythagoras was the first that used the word ΚΟΣΜΟΣ to signify the WORLD or the HEAVENS. Phavorinus[h] says, (they are the words of Laërtius,) *that Pythagoras first named the heavens ΚΟΣΜΟΣ.* So Plutarch too, *De Plac. Philos.*;

[e] Athen. p. 522. [=IV. 441. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

[f] Id. p. 622. [=V. 253. *ed. Schw.*, where ταραντῖνον.—D.]

[g] Eust. ad Dionys. v. 376.

[* See Wesseling's note on Diod. Siculus, v. i. p. 492.—D.]

[h] Laërt., Pythag. Τὸν οὐρανὸν πρῶτον ὀνομάσαι κόσμον.

Pythagoras first called the whole compass of the universe ΚΟΣΜΟΝ, *from the order,* τῆς ΤΑΞΕΩΣ, *he observed there.*[i] And the very same words are in the *Philosophic History* ascribed to Galen.[j] Add to these the Scholiast on Homer, who says, Ἡ τοῦ κόσμου ΤΑΞΙΣ, *the order of the universe was named* ΚΟΣΜΟΣ *by Pythagoras*:[k] and the anonymous author of that philosopher's Life, Πρῶτος, says he, Πυθαγόρας τὸν οὐρανὸν ΚΟΣΜΟΝ προσηγόρευσε. Is it not plain, now, that the writer of Zaleucus's laws was younger than Pythagoras? since he not only cites ΚΟΣΜΟΣ in the very same signification that Pythagoras first put upon 't, but subjoins too the word ΤΑΞΙΣ, which we see here was the very reason why Pythagoras called the world ΚΟΣΜΟΣ. 'Tis true, in those passages of Plutarch and Galen there immediately follows, Θαλῆς καὶ οἱ ἀφ' [ἀπ'] αὐτοῦ ἕνα τὸν κόσμον. From whence, perhaps, a man of Mr. B.'s sagacity and learning may infer that Thales too, who was a generation before Pythagoras, and, as many say, was his master, called the universe ΚΟΣΜΟΣ. But surely we must not think Plutarch and the other author so very stupid as to contradict themselves in one and the same line. We must understand them, that Thales spoke of the thing signified by κοσμὸς, but not that he used the word: he might say, ἓν τὸ πᾶν, or ἓν τὸ σύστημα τῶν ὅλων, or some other expression of the same import. And besides, we are informed by very good hands, Laërtius and Themistius, that Thales writ nothing himself: so that if κοσμὸς had really occurred in any treatise ascribed to him, it had been a good argument that the treatise was spurious, but none at all that Pythagoras did not first call the universe ΚΟΣΜΟΣ.

V. In the same Preface it presently follows, Ὡς οὐ τιμᾶται θεὸς ὑπ' ἀνθρώπου φαύλου, οὐδὲ θεραπεύεται δαπάναις οὐδὲ ΤΡΑΓΩιΔΙΑΙΣ τῶν ἁλισκομένων, καθάπερ μοχ-

[i] Plut. Pl. Phil. ii. 1.
[j] Gal. p. 429.
[k] Schol. ad Iliad. i. v. 1.

θηρὸς ἄνθρωπος. Where, instead of *ἁλισκομένων*, which in this place makes no tolerable sense, the true reading seems to be *ἁλισγουμένων*; and then the meaning will be, *that God is not honoured by a wicked man, nor pleased with the costly and pompous sacrifices of polluted persons, as if he was a vile mortal.* Now, this paragraph alone is sufficient to detect the imposture of these pretended laws. For, as I have shewn above, the true Zaleucus lived before Draco, who made laws for the Athenians at or before Olymp. XXXIX.: but the word *ΤΡΑΓΩιΔΙΑ* was not coined, nor the thing expressed by it invented, till Thespis won the goat, the prize of his play, about Olymp. LX., above LXXX. years after Draco. How, then, came the word *τραγῳδία* into the laws of Zaleucus, which were written above CXX. years before Thespis? I do not wonder, now, that Zaleucus was so generally believed to have all his laws from Minerva; for nothing less than a deity could have foreknown the word *τραγῳδία* a whole century and more before it came into being. But, besides that the very word was not at all heard of in Zaleucus's time, we must observe too that it's used by him metaphorically for *sumptuousness and pomp*, which is a sense that could not be put upon it till a long time after Thespis. For in the infancy of tragedy there was nothing pompous nor sumptuous upon the stage; no scenes, nor pictures, nor machines, nor rich habits for the actors, which, after they were introduced there, gave the sole occasion to the metaphor. For the first scene was made by Agatharchus for one of Æschylus's plays, as Vitruvius tells us; *Primùm Agatharchus Athenis, Æschylo docente tragœdiam, scenam fecit, et de eâ commentarium reliquit.*[1] This Agatharchus was a painter, who learned the art by himself without any master, as Olympiodorus says in his MS. Commentary on Plato's *Phædo*; *Γεγόνασί τινες καὶ αὐτοδίδακτοι Ἡράκλειτος ὁ Αἰγύπτιος γεωργός . . . . Φήμιος, Ἀγάθαρχος ὁ γραφεύς*. For it's most probable he means the same

[1] Vitruv. Præf. lib. vii.

Agatharchus that made Æschylus's scene for him. And that all the other ornaments were first brought in by Æschylus, we have the unanimous testimony of all antiquity. Now, the first play that Æschylus made was at Olymp. LXX., and the last at Olymp. LXXX.; and in what part of this XL. years' interval he invented those ornaments for pomp and show, we cannot now tell.[m] But suppose, if you please, that he invented them at the very first play, and that the metaphor that makes *τραγῳδία* signify pomp came immediately into use upon the sight of them, neither of which are at all probable; yet even still it will be above CLX. years after the time of the true Zaleucus.

VI. The last argument that I shall offer against the laws of Zaleucus is this, that the Preface of them, which Stobæus has produced, is written in the *common* dialect, as the old grammarians have called it, whereas it ought to be in Doric: for that was the language of the Locri Epizephyrii, as it appears from the treatise of Timæus the Locrian extant in Plato, and from the epigrams of Nossis. I do not know that it has yet been observed that this Nossis was a Locrian:

[m] But we may make a near guess at it from the accounts we have of Agatharchus the painter, who first made a scene, according to Vitruvius, whom I cited above. Ἀγάθαρχος, says Harpocration, *τούτου μνημονεύει Δημοσθένης· ὁ δὲ ζωγράφος ἀτιφανής, Εὐδήμου υἱός, τὸ δὲ γένος Σάμιος.* The very same words are to be found in Suidas. Now, the passage where Demosthenes speaks of him is in his Oration against Midias, p. 360. But there's a larger account of him in Plutarch's Life of Alcibiades, and the largest of all in Andocides's Oration against Alcibiades. The substance of all their story is, that Alcibiades forcibly detained Agatharchus in his house, and would not let him stir out till he had painted it. Now, Alcibiades died Olymp. XCIV. 1. (Diodor.), when he was about XL. years old (Corn. Nepos). And we can hardly suppose him less than XX. when he had this frolic upon Agatharchus. Especially if what Demosthenes's Scholiast says be true, that the reason of it was, because Agatharchus was taken in bed with Alcibiades's miss. Agatharchus, then, was by this account alive still about Olymp. LXXXIX. 1., which is XXXVI. years after Olymp. LXXX., when Æschylus's last play was acted. It's plain, then, he was but a young man even at Olymp. LXXX.; and if we consider he was *αὐτοδίδακτος*, his own master in painting, and took it up of himself, we can scarce suppose he could invent the painting of scenes till very near that Olympiad. [*Adden.*]

and therefore I shall make bold to give an epigram or two of hers, which will shew at once both her country and her dialect.

Ὦ ξεῖν', εἰ τύ γ' ἔπεις ποτὶ καλλίχορον Μιτυλάναν,
Τᾶν Σαπφοῦς χαρίτων ἄνθος ἐναυσόμενος,
Εἰπεῖν, ὡς Μούσαισι φίλα, τήνᾳ τε Λόκρισσα
*Τίκτεν ἴσαις, ὅτι θ' οἱ τοὔνομα Νόσσις· ἴθι.**

So this epigram is to be read, which is faulty in Holstenius and Berkelius's notes upon Stephanus; and the meaning of it is, that Nossis addresses herself to a traveller, and desires him, if ever he go to Mitylene, where Sappho was born, to say, that a Locrian woman writ poems like hers, and that her name was Nossis. *Ἴσαις* is the accusative Doric and Æolic for *ἴσας*, *i. e.* *χάριτας*. And that this is the true sense of it, will be further evident from another epigram of hers, not published before, where she celebrates the Locrians her countrymen;

Ἔντεα Βρέντιοι ἄνδρες ἀφ' αἰνομόρων βάλον ὤμων,
Θεινόμενοι Λοκρῶν χερσὶν ὑπ' ὠκυμάχων·
Ὧν ἀρετὰν ὑμνεῦντα, θεῶν ὑπ' ἀνάκτορα κεῖνται·
Οὐδὲ ποθεῦντι κακῶν πάχεας, οὓς ἔλιπον.†

The import of which is, that the Locrians had obtained a victory over the Brutians their neighbours, and had hung up

[* *Anth. Gr. ex rec. Br.* (*ed. Jacobs.*) I. 129.—*Anth. Gr. ad fid. Cod. Pal. &c.* I. 526.—Porson thus restores it;

Ὦ ξεῖν' εἰ τύ γε πλεῖς ποτὶ καλλίχορον Μιτυλάναν,
Τᾶν Σαπφὼ Χαρίτων ἄνθος ἐνοψόμενος,
Εἰπεῖν, ὡς Μουσαῖσι ΦΙΛΑΘΗΝ, Α ΤΕ Λόκρις γᾶ
Τίκτεν, ΙΣΑΙΣ Θ' ὅτι μοι τοὔνομα Νόσσις, ἴθι.
Gaisford, ad Hephæst. p. 10.

With reference to the epigram, as given by Bentley, we are told in Kidd's ed. of Porson's *Tracts, &c.*: "*ἐναυσόμενος* MSti Vaticani servabat R. P., cetera ut "apud Gaisford," &c. p. 316.—D.]

[† *Anth. Gr. ex rec. Br.* (*ed. Jacobs.*) I. 128.—*Anth. Gr. ad fid. Cod. Pal. &c.* I. 229.—D.]

in the temples of the gods those shields they had taken which now did not desire to return to those cowards that wore them before. And by this we may have some discovery of Nossis's age, which hitherto has been thought uncertain; for the *Βρέντιοι* or *Βρέττιοι*, whom she speaks of there, were not formed into a body, nor called by that name, till Olymp. CVI. 1., in Dionysius the Younger's time.[n] She cannot, therefore, be more ancient than Olymp. CVI.; but that she was a little younger is plain from her epigram[o] upon the tomb of Rhintho the Tarentine, or, as she calls him, the Syracusian, her contemporary, who lived in the time of the first Ptolemy, about Ol. CXIV.[p] Her mother's name was Theuphilis, the daughter of Cleocha, as another epigram of hers taught me, yet unpublished;

Ἥρα τιμηέσσα, Λακείνιον ἃ τὸ θυῶδες
Πολλάκις οὐρανόθεν νισσομένα καθορῇς,
Δέξαι βύσσινον εἶμα, τό τοι μετὰ παιδὸς ἀγαυᾶς
*Νοσσίδος ὕφανεν Θεύφιλις ἁ Κλεόχας.**

In the MS. it is *Θευφίλης*. And we may observe, that even this too confirms it, that she was a Locrian, because she speaks of *Λακείνιον*; for the famous temple of Juno Lacinia was not far from Locri, in the neighbourhood of Crotona. She had a daughter called Melinna, as another MS. epigram seems to shew; though it's possible she may mean there another's daughter, and not her own: however, it deserves to be put here for it's singular elegancy;

Αὐτομέλιννα τέτυκται· ἴδ' ὡς ἀγανὸν τὸ πρόσωπον
Ἁμὲ ποτοπτάζειν μειλιχίως δοκέει·

[n] Diod. p. 418. Strabo, p. 255. Justin, xxiii. 1.

[o] Anthol. iii. 6. [*Anth. Gr. ex rec. Br.* (*ed. Jacobs.*) I. 129.—*Anth. Gr. ad fid. Cod. Pal. &c.* I. 429.—D.]

[p] Suid. Ῥινθ.

[* *Anth. Gr. ex rec. Br.* (*ed. Jacobs.*) I. 127.—*Anth. Gr. ad fid. Cod. Pal. &c.* I. 273.—D.]

Ὡς ἐτύμως θυγάτηρ τᾷ ματέρι πάντα ποτῴκει·
*Ἢ καλὸν ὄκκα πέλοι τέκνα γονεῦσιν ἴσα.**

Αὐτομέλιννα, that is *Melinna herself*, not her picture, 'tis so exactly like her; so *αὐτοζωή*, *αὐτοαλήθεια*. In the MS. it's *ἄ με*; but the true reading is *ἀμὲ*, Doric for *ἐμέ*. For *ποτῴκει* the MS. has it *προσῴκει*; but I have changed *πρὸς* into the Doric preposition *ποτί*. From the preterperfect tense of verbs the Dorians form a present, as from *δέδοικα* they make *δεδοίκω*, from *δέδυκα*, *δεδύκω*. So that from *προσ-έοικε*, *to be like*, as a picture's like the original, our female poet forms *ποτ-εοίκω*, and then contracts it *ποτῴκω*. So much was necessary to be said, to make this epigram intelligible. I return now to the Locrian dialect, which *a Locrian song*, *Λοκρικὸν ἆσμα*, in Athenæus,[q] sufficiently proves to be the Doric;

Μὴ προδῶς ἄμ', ἱκετεύω· πρὶν καὶ μολὲν κεῖνον, ἀνίστω·
Μὴ κακὸν μέγα ποιήσῃς καί με τὴν δειλάκραν.
Ἀμέρα καὶ ἤδη τὸ φῶς, διὰ τᾶς θυρίδος οὐκ ἐσορῇς;

So this passage ought to be read, and the version should be thus;

[* *Anth. Gr. ex rec. Br.* (*ed. Jacobs.*) I. 128.—*Anth. Gr. ad fid. Cod. Pal. fo.* I. 301.—D.]

[q] Athen. p. 697. [=V. 551. *ed. Schw.*, where the last two lines are read and pointed,

μὴ κακὸν μέγα ποιήσῃς σε, καί με τὴν δειλάκραν.
ἀμέρα καὶ ἤδη. τὸ φῶς διὰ τᾶς θυρίδος οὐκ ἐσορῇς;

The insertion of *σε* is Toup's conjecture.

"I would read the Locrian song thus:

μὴ προδῷς ἄμ' ἱκετεύω·
πρὶν ἢ μόλεν κεῖνον ἀνίστω,
μὴ κακὸν μέγα ποιή-
σῃς κἀμὲ τὰν δειλάκραν· ἀ-
μέρα γὰρ ἤδη· διὰ τᾶς
θυρίδος τὸ φῶς οὐκ ἐσορῇς;"

DOBREE'S *Advers.* ii. 366.—D.]

Ne prodas me, obsecro: priùs quàm ille veniat, surge.

Sunt verba mulieris ad mœchum suum, ut surgere velit, priùs quàm vir domum redeat, et ipsum deprendat. And it now apparent what good reason Athenæus had to call the Locrian songs μοιχικοί: and we cannot doubt but he meant the Locrians of Italy, if we consider what account he gives of the women of that place.[r] And now, to bring this argument to a conclusion: since it evidently appears that the Locrian language was Doric, without all question the laws of that city were written in that dialect, as certainly were Solon's laws at Athens were written in Attic. These of Zaleucus, therefore, are commentitious, because they are not in Doric. Unless Mr. B. will be as zealous for *his* [illegible] *Zaleucus* as he is for *his prince Phalaris;* and contend that the *king's* laws were *transdialected*, as well as the *prince's* epistles.

I. This metaphor of τραγῳδία for solemnity and pomp invites me to step out of my way a little, and to consider the laws ascribed to Charondas, for we have there too the very same metaphor. Diodorus speaks prolixly of these laws,[s] and the proœmia of them are recorded in Stobæus, where among others, we have this, *that a man who is a slave to riches ought to be despised, as one of a mean spirit,* ὡς καταπληττόμενος ὑπὸ κτημάτων πολυτελῶν καὶ βίου ΤΡΑΓΩΙΔΟΥΜΕΝΟΥ, *since he's smitten so much with wealth and a sumptuous and pompous life.*[t] This, as I observed already, is the very same figure of speech with that in Zaleucus, and is borrowed from the costly and gaudy ornaments of the stage. Now, the laws of the Thurians were made at Olymp. LXXXIV., which was the time when that colony was planted: but I hardly think that this metaphor of τραγῳδία for magnificence and pomp was so early in use as Olymp. LXXXIV. At that time Æschylus was newly dead,

[r] Athen. p. 516. [=IV. 417. *ed. Schw.*—D.]
[s] Diod. p. 79 to 84. [t] Stob. Serm. 42.

ophocles was in his prime at LIV. years of age, and Euri-
ides had just entered upon the province of tragedy. Now,
ne last of these poets was so far from giving occasion to
his metaphor by the rich ornaments of his scenes and
ctors, that he was noted for the quite contrary way, as
ntroducing his heroes in mere rags. So Æschylus accuses
him in Aristophanes's *Ranæ*;[u]

Ὦ πτωχοποιὲ καὶ ῥακιοσυῤῥαπτάδη.

And the comedian himself, in another of his plays,[v] most pleasantly rallies him upon the same account, and reckons up five of his shabby heroes, that gave names to as many of his tragedies, *Œneus*, *Phœnix*, *Philoctetes*, *Bellerophontes*, *Telephus*. 'Tis true, it appears, from this very ridiculing of Euripides, that the other tragedians were not guilty of the same fault of bringing beggars upon the stage; but, however, even the persons that they introduced were not clad so very gorgeously as to make tragedy become a metaphor for *sumptuousness*. For money was at that time a scarce commodity in Greece, especially at Athens,[w] and the people were frugal; so that they had not much to lay out upon ornaments for the stage, nor much inclination, had they had it. Nay, we are sure that for a hundred years after the beginning of the Thurian government, the expense and furniture of tragedy was very moderate; for Demosthenes, in his action against Midias, which was made Olymp. CVII. 4.,[x] has informed us that the charge of a *tragic chorus* was MUCH LESS than that of the *chorus of musicians*, which usually performed too at the same festivals of Bacchus. *Τραγῳδοῖς*, says he, *κεχορήγηκέ ποτε οὗτος· ἐγὼ δὲ αὐληταῖς ἀνδράσι. Καὶ ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ ἀνάλωμα ἐκείνης τῆς δαπάνης πολλῷ πλεῖόν ἐστιν, οὐδεὶς ἀγνοεῖ δήπου*; i. e. *Midias*

[u] Arist. Ran. p. 164. [=v. 841. *ed. Bekk.*, where (as in all eds.) Καὶ πτωχ., κ.τ.λ.—D.]

[v] Id. Acharn. p. 279, 280. [=v. 393. et sq. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

[w] Cic. Tuscul. v. 32.

[x] Dionys. Halic. de Demost.

was once the furnisher of a tragic chorus; but I, of a chorus of musicians: and there's nobody but knows that the expense of this is MUCH GREATER *than the charge of that.*[y] And yet the cost even of a music chorus was no very great matter, as we gather from this, that Demosthenes alone bore it all, and voluntarily too. 'Tis true he magnifies it as much as he can, and questions whether he should call it *generosity* or *madness* in himself, to undertake an expense above his estate and condition:[z] but we ought to receive this as a cast of his rhetoric; for, to be sure, he would never undo himself, by taking an office which nobody forced upon him. But another orator, Lysias, a little ancienter than he, has given us a punctual account of the several expenses of the stage. *When Theopompus*, says he,[a] *was archon* (Olymp. XCII. 2.), *I was furnisher to a tragic chorus, and I laid out* XXX. *minæ. Afterwards I got the victory with the chorus of men, and it cost me* XX. *minæ. When Glaucippus was archon* (Olymp. XCII. 3.), *I laid out* VIII. *minæ upon the Pyrrhichists. Again, I won the victory with the chorus of men, and with that and the charge of the tripus I expended* L. *minæ. And when Diocles was archon* (Olymp. XCII. 4.), *I laid out upon the cyclian chorus* III. *minæ.** *Afterwards, when Alexias was archon* (Olymp. XCIII. 4.), *I furnished a chorus of boys, and it cost me above* XV. *minæ. And when Euclides was archon* (Olymp. XCIV. 2.), *I was at the charge of* XVI. *minæ upon the comedians, and of* VII. *upon the young Pyrrhichists.* Now, an Attic mina being equivalent to three pounds of English money, it is plain, from this passage of Lysias, that the whole charge of a tragic chorus did but then amount to XC. pounds sterling. By the way, I shall correct a fault in the orator Isæus.[b] *Οὗτος γὰρ τῇ μὲν φυλῇ εἰς Διονύσια χορηγήσας, τέταρτος ἐγένετο, τραγῳδοῖς δὲ καὶ πυῤῥιέταις ὕστα-*

[y] Demost. c. Midiam, p. 362. [z] Ibid. p. 336.

[* "The charge of the cyclian chorus Dr. Bentley probably wrote CCC. *minæ*, "as it is in Lysias, quoted by Meursius. The printer changed this into III. "*minæ*." BLOMFIELD, *Mus. Crit.* ii. 84.—D.]

[a] Lysias in Ἀπολ. Δωροδοκίας. [b] P. 54.

τος. Correct it, τέταρτος ἐγένετο τραγῳδοῖς, καὶ πυῤῥιχισταῖς ὕστατος.[c] *This man*, says he, *being to furnish out choruses at the festivals of Bacchus, did it so meanly, that in the tragic chorus he came but the fourth, and in the Pyrrhichists he was last of all.* And now I refer it to the reader, whether, considering this true account of the small charge of a tragic chorus, even in Lysias' and Demosthenes's time, he can think it probable that at the LXXXIVth Olympiad the tragic ornaments were so famous for their richness, as to give rise to the metaphor of τραγῳδία for sumptuousness; especially in Italy, where perhaps at that time no tragedy had ever been acted. I must own, it seems to me a very unlikely thing that this metaphor should so quickly obtain even in common conversation, much less be admitted into a body of laws, where the language ought to be plain and proper, and where any metaphor at all makes but a very bad figure, especially a new one, as this must needs be then, which perhaps could not be understood, at first hearing, by one-half of the citizens. 'Tis true, when tragedy was propagated from Athens into the courts of princes, the splendour of the tragic chorus was exceedingly magnificent, as at Alexandria and Rome, &c., which gave occasion to that complaint of Horace's, that the show of plays was so very gaudy, that few minded the words of them;[d]

Tanto cum strepitu ludi spectantur, et artes,
Divitiæque peregrinæ: quibus oblitus actor
Cùm stetit in scenâ, concurrit dextera lævæ.
Dixit adhuc aliquid? Nil sanè. Quid placet ergo?
Lana Tarentino violas imitata veneno.

And in another place he says[e] the tragic actor was

Regali conspectus in auro nuper et ostro.

'Tis no wonder, therefore, that in those ages τραγῳδία might be used metaphorically to signify riches and splendour; and

[c] One may correct it also πυῤῥίχαις, which comes to the same thing. [*Adden.*]
[d] Hor. Ep. ii. 1. [203.—D.] [e] Id. in Arte Poët. [228.—D.]

so Philo and Lucian, and some others, use it: but I do not find any example of it within a whole century of the date of Charondas's laws.

II. But this objection will be much more considerable if Charondas really lived before the original of the Thurian government, and even before Æschylus himself, the first inventor of tragic ornaments; for it will then be of equal force against Charondas's laws as against those of Zaleucus. Theodoret tells us,[f] *that Charondas is said to have been the first law-maker of Italy and Sicily.* And if this be true, he must be senior to Zaleucus himself, and before the very name of tragedy, much more before the use of this metaphor taken from it. Or, if we allow of their reckonings[g] that make Charondas the scholar of Zaleucus, it's more than enough to our present purpose; for they supposed his master Zaleucus to have been contemporary with Lycurgus the Spartan; by which account they must place Charondas ccc. years before Thespis. Nay, even according to Eusebius, Zaleucus's laws bear date above cc. years before the founding of Thurii, and above c. before the original of tragedy. But we have a better authority than these; I mean, Heraclides in his book *Of Governments*, who informs us, *that the Rhegians of Italy were governed by an aristocracy; for a thousand men, chosen out according to their estates, managed every thing; and their laws were those of Charondas the Catanian:*[h] *but Anaxilas the Messanian made himself tyrant there.* Which account is confirmed in the main by Aristotle, when he says, *the oligarchy of Rhegium was changed into a tyranny by Anaxilas.*[i] Here, I conceive, Heraclides has very plainly asserted that Charondas's laws were made before the time of Anaxilas: but we are sure this Anaxilas died at Ol. LXXVI. 1.,[j] after he had reigned at Rhegium and Messana XVIII. years at the least, which commence

[f] Theodoret. c. Græc. Serm. 9. [g] In Aristot. Pol. ii. 12.

[h] Heraclid. de Polit. Νόμοις ἐχρῶντο τοῖς Χαρώνδου τοῦ Καταναίου.

[i] Arist. Pol. v. 12. [j] See here, Sect. IV. [which begins at p. 204.—D.]

from Olymp. LXXI. 3. Now, the first victory that Æschylus won at the stage was at Olymp. LXXIII. 3.;[k] and we may fairly suppose, because he never got the prize till then, that he had not invented scenes and machines, and the other ornaments, before. If Charondas's laws, therefore, were made but the very year that Anaxilas usurped the government, yet they are older by VIII. years than the original of tragical scenes. But, without question, Charondas's form of government had been a good while in Rhegium before Anaxilas subverted it; for the city had been built then CC. years; and the very account in Heraclides clearly implies that the aristocracy was of some continuance.

III. And if this be allowed, we may safely infer that Charondas was no THURIAN, as some of the later authors call him, Valerius Maximus[l] and Themistius,[m] and particularly Diodorus, where, speaking of the founding of the city Thurii, he says, the Thurians chose Charondas, *τὸν ἄριστον τῶν πολιτῶν, the best and wisest of the citizens,*[n] to draw up a body of laws for them. For since he made laws a considerable time before Anaxilas's tyranny, Olymp. LXXI., he could hardly be alive still at Thurii Olymp. LXXXIV., which was L. years after. And, indeed, there's not one of the old writers, that I know of, who either says he was a Thurian, or that he made laws for the Thurians. Plato tells us, *that Italy and Sicily*[o] *profited by the laws of Charondas,* but the cities he does not name. We must learn those of his scholar Aristotle, who expresses himself more particularly, *that Charondas the Catanian gave laws to his own city and the other Chalcidic cities in Italy and Sicily.* Now,

[k] Marm. Arund.

[l] Val. Max. vi. 5.

[m] Themist. Orat. xiv. [=Or. ii. p. 31. *ed. Hard.*—D.] Καὶ τοῦ Θουρίου Χαράνδα.

[n] Diod. p. 79. [*εἵλοντο δὲ καὶ νομοθέτην τὸν ἄριστον τὸν ἐν παιδείᾳ θαυμαζόμενον* [l. *ἄριστον τῶν ἐν παιδείᾳ θαυμαζομένων*] *πολιτῶν Χαράνδαν.* I. 485. *ed. Wessel.*—D.]

[o] Plato, Polit. x. Ἰταλία καὶ Σικελία.

the Chalcidic towns in Sicily were,[p] Zancle, Naxos, Leontini, Catana, Eubœa, Mylæ, Himera, Callipolis; in Italy there was Rhegium; and if any other, I know not. But that neither Thurii, nor Sybaris before it, was a Chalcidic colony, is most certain. Heraclides, therefore, agrees with his master Aristotle, where he tells us, as we have cited before, *that Charondas was a Catanian, and lawgiver to the Rhegians*. Now, what could be the reason of this difference between all the old and some of the later writers, but that, in the interval of time between them, which was about ccc. years, these pretended laws of Charondas came abroad as directed to the Thurians, and calling him a Thurian? But we see the true laws of Charondas, which Aristotle and Heraclides had, were made for the Chalcidic towns, not for Thurii. How could these be the same, then? Unless, perhaps, some may suppose that the Thurians agreed to take the laws of Charondas, which were ready made to their hands, as those of Mazaca in Cilicia did:[q] so that Charondas's laws might be given at Catana and Rhegium a good while before Olymp. LXXI., and yet given too at Thurii at Olymp. LXXXIV. 1. This supposition, indeed, may serve to shew how Charondas's laws might possibly be Thurian; but it cannot excuse Diodorus and the rest, who call Charondas himself a Thurian; since by this account he was dead before Thurii was ever heard of. But, in the next place, what if I prove that neither himself nor his laws were received by the Thurians? then, I humbly conceive, that copy of them which Diodorus used will be allowed to have been a cheat.

III.* If we will take Athenæus's word, ZALEUCUS was

[p] See Scymnus Chius, and others. [q] Strabo, p. 529.

[* This section should be the IVth, the next the Vth, &c.: but on account of a reference in a preceding note to the sections as marked in Bentley's own edition, I have made no alteration in the numbers.

In the *Addenda* to the original ed. of this work is a passage headed "P. 365, &c. about Charondas's not being lawgiver to the Thurians." P. 365 of the old ed. corresponds to p. 404-5 of the present ed.; but I have followed the example

lawgiver to the Thurians;[s] though, a little before, he had quoted a law of his to the Locrians.[t] Which is a sign that he did not out of ignorance mistake the one city for the other. By the Thurians here he seems to understand the Sybarites, who were afterwards called Thurians: and we may suppose that at their settlement, Olymp. LXXXIV., they continued their old constitution of government, made at first by Zaleucus; for that the ancient Sybarites once used his laws appears from Scymnus Chius, who assigns this for one of the causes of their ruin, that they did not adhere to them;[u]

Λέγεται γὰρ αὐτοὺς μήτε τοῖς νόμοις ἔτι
Τοῖς τοῦ Ζαλεύκου τἀκόλουθα συντελεῖν.

And that the Thurians at their first plantation received* them again, though they refined and multiplied them even to excess, we may gather from Ephorus;[v] who, speaking of Zaleucus's laws which he made for the Locrians, and commending them for their simplicity, *But the Thurians,* says he, *afterwards aiming at exactness in every thing, grew more famous by it, but were worse governed.* For the fairest exposition of this passage seems to be this, that the Thurians had once the laws of Zaleucus, which afterwards they refined upon. And, if we consider those passages of Athenæus and Scymnus, it may pass too for the truest.

IV. But however, whether Zaleucus's laws were received or not by the Thurians, those of Charondas we may justly believe were not, by the accounts we have of both his and

of Lennep, who, in his Latin version, has placed the passage in question at the end of the disquisition concerning the laws of Charondas: see p. 417.—D.]

[s] Athen. p. 508. [=IV. 389. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

[t] Id. p. 429. [=IV. 69. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

[u] Scymnus Chius, v. 345. [p. 20. *G. V. Ox.* ii.—D.]

[* It may be conjectured that for "received" we ought to read "revived," (and Lennep translates the word "*instaurasse*"); but compare the first line of the next section.—D.]

[v] Strabo, p. 260.

theirs. There's a large fragment[w] of Theophrastus's (I suppose out of his tracts about laws), which gives us some notices about the Thurian laws concerning buying and selling.[x] *The buyer was to give earnest to the seller presently, and a piece of money to three of the next neighbours, that they might remember and bear witness of the bargain; and then the same day he was to pay the whole price,*[y] *and if he failed to pay it, he lost his earnest.*[z] *And if the seller did not stand to his bargain, he lost as much money as the thing was sold for;*[a] *which,* says Theophrastus, *was a very unequal penalty, that the buyer should forfeit the earnest only, and the seller the whole price, the one being so much more than the other. But Charondas and Plato,* says he, *went another way to work; for they enact that all buying and selling shall be with ready payment; and if any man trust, it shall be at his own peril. The law shall give him no remedy if he's cheated; for by trusting, he brought the cheat upon himself.*[b] Now, that Theophrastus reports this truly of Plato, it appears from Plato himself, in the XI. book of his *Laws*, where this very order about buying and selling is still extant. We may fairly suppose, therefore, that Theophrastus is as exact in what he says of Charondas. And I conceive it's as plain here that Charondas's laws were different from the Thurians', as that ready payment is different from giving earnest and being trusted. The passage of Theophrastus is both faulty in the original, and mistaken by the interpreter; but the reader may easily see how it ought to be corrected and translated, by the places I have cited in the margin.

V. We have very good evidence that the form of government which Charondas's laws were adapted to was an

[w] Stob. Serm. 48. [42.—D.]

[x] Οἱ δὲ Θουριακοὶ, &c.

[y] Ἐν τοῖς Θουρίων τὸν μὲν ἀῤῥαβῶνα παραχρῆμα, τὴν δὲ τιμὴν αὐθήμερον.

[z] Στέρησις τοῦ ἀῤῥαβῶνος· οὕτω γὰρ . . . . οἱ Θουριακοί.

[a] Ἕκτισις ὅσου ἂν ἀποδῶται· καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο ἐν τοῖς Θουρίων ἡ ἄνισος ζημία.

[b] Χαρώνδας καὶ Πλάτων . . . . παραχρῆμα κελεύουσι διδόναι καὶ λαμβάνειν· ἐὰν δέ τις πιστεύσῃ, μὴ εἶναι δίκην· αὐτὸν γὰρ αἴτιον εἶναι τῆς ἀδικίας.

aristocracy, or oligarchy. *Many of those lawgivers,* says Aristotle, *that design to establish aristocracies mistake themselves.*[c] Then he reckons up five artifices by which they impose upon the people; and to one of them he adds, *ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς Χαρώνδα νόμοις, as it is in the laws of Charondas:* and he concludes the whole with this, *Ταῦτα μὲν ὀλιγαρχικὰ σοφίσματα τῆς νομοθεσίας, these are oligarchical artifices in making of laws.* This passage is a most plain intimation of what I asserted above: but Heraclides says it down-right, in his account of the Rhegians, *who formed themselves,* says he, *into an aristocracy, being governed by χίλιοι, a thousand of the wealthiest citizens, and using the laws of Charondas.*[d] Add the other places of Aristotle, where he says, *the Rhegian government was changed from an oligarchy to a tyranny by Anaxilas;*[e] nay, *and that the Thurian government was ὀλιγαρχικωτέρα, a sort of oligarchy;*[f] and then I suppose this point will be sufficiently proved. But Diodorus, from the copy of Charondas which he used, represents the constitution to be a *democracy;* as when he says, *a man that proposed a new law must have a rope about his neck till ὁ ΔΗΜΟΣ, the* PEOPLE, *determined for or against it:*[g] and again, *that a woman without any fortune κατέφυγεν εἰς* τὸν ΔΗΜΟΝ, appealed to the* PEOPLE;[h] *and the* PEOPLE, *τοῦ δὲ ΔΗΜΟΥ, voted to make a new law for her:*[i] and lastly, *that a blind man advised τοῖς ΠΛΗΘΕΣΙ, the* MULTITUDE, *to alter a law:*[j] add to these his express declaration, that *the Thurians formed πολίτευμα ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΚΟΝ, a democratical government;*[k] and then I suppose it will appear very probable that Diodorus's copy of Charondas's laws was not the same with that of Aristotle and Heraclides.

VI. *Charondas,* says Aristotle, *had οὐδὲν ἴδιον, nothing*

[c] Aristot. Pol. iv. 12, 13.
[d] Heraclid. de Polit.
[e] Aristot. Pol. v. 12.
[f] Ibid. v. 7.
[g] Diod. p. 82.
[* Diod. ἐπί.—D.]
[h] P. 83.
[i] P. 84.
[j] P. 83.
[k] P. 78.

peculiar in his laws, except one.[l] On the contrary, Diodorus tells us, from his copy, *that he had πολλὰ ἴδια, many things peculiar,*[m] and reckons half a score of them; and yet that single thing observed by Aristotle does not appear among them. Does not this look as if the laws they speak of were quite different? This is one shrewd suspicion that Diodorus's copy was not genuine. But let us consider the philosopher's words; *Χαρώνδου ἴδιον μὲν οὐδέν ἐστιν, πλὴν αἱ δίκαι τῶν ΨΕΥΔΟΜΑΡΤΥΡΩΝ· πρῶτος γὰρ ἐποίησε τὴν ΕΠΙΣΚΕΨΙΝ.* So the passage is read in the common editions; and the interpreter translates it, *Primus his de rebus accuratè consideravit;* which is quite beside the sense of the author. There are two faults in the Greek, that must first be corrected, before we can come at the right meaning. First, for *ψευδομαρτύρων* we must read *ψευδομαρτυριῶν*; because *δίκη* is joined with the name of the things, and not of the persons; as *δίκη ἀσεβείας, ἀγαμίου, ὀψιγαμίου,* &c., not *δίκη ἀσεβῶν, ἀγάμων, ὀψιγάμων.* Demosthenes *contra Euergum, Ταῖς δίκαις τῶν ψευδομαρτυριῶν.*[n] Isæus, *Τὴν τῶν ψευδομαρτυριῶν δίκην ἠγωνίζετο.*[o] And again, *Ἡ τῶν ψευδομαρτυριῶν δίκη εἰσῄει.*[p] 'Tis a fault, therefore, in the same orator where we read, *Τὴν τῶν ψευδομαρτύρων δίκην εἵλομεν;*[q] and in Pollux, *Κατὰ τῶν ψευδῆ μαρτυρούντων δίκη, ὃ καὶ ἐπισκήψασθαι καταμαρτύριον ἐλέγετο;*[r] we must correct it, *ἐπισκήψασθαι ψευδομαρτυριῶν*; as the excellent MS. of the late learned Isaac Vossius has it. The other fault in Aristotle is *ἐπίσκεψις*; the true emendation of which is *ἐπίσκηψις*, which signifies an action at law against false witnesses. For if a man was cast in a trial by false testimony, he might enter his plea to have another trial to prove the witnesses perjured. Charondas, therefore, according to Aristotle, first ordained this *ἐπίσκηψις*; and if we could know the first date of it, we might then arrive at the

[l] Aristot. Pol. ii. 12.
[m] Diod. p. 79.
[n] P. 638.
[o] P. 38.
[p] P. 52.
[q] P. 38.
[r] Pollux, viii. 6. [p. 847. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

true age of Charondas. The Athenian orators often mention this ἐπίσκηψις as a law in force at Athens; so Demosthenes, Isæus, Lysias,[s] and out of them the lexicographers, Pollux, Harpocration, Suidas, Etymolog. But whether it was one of Solon's laws, or at what time made after his death, I am not able to tell. But there's a probability that it was made before the founding of Thurii, rather than after. For Lysias, who in his youth was one of that colony that founded Thurii, speaks, we see, of this ἐπίσκηψις, and without any hint that it was a new law. And he returned from Thurii to Athens at Ol. XCII. 1. Take the middle, therefore, between the institution of Solon's laws, Olymp. XLVI. 3. and the pleadings of Lysias, and it will fall upon Olymp. LXIX. 2., which is LIX. years before the founding of Thurii. So much odds are there that the ἐπίσκηψις was enacted at Athens before Thurii was founded, and consequently that Charondas, the first author of the ἐπίσκηψις, was more ancient than that colony; and, by consequence, that the copy of his laws which Diodorus used was supposititious.

VII. The case of Charondas in Stobæus is the very reverse of Zaleucus's; for he has made Zaleucus write his laws in the common dialect, who, as a Locrian, ought to have used the Doric; and he has introduced Charondas in the Doric dialect, who, either as a Catanian or a Thurian, would more probably have used another. For Catana and the other cities that Aristotle says he gave laws to were Chalcidic, that is, Ionic colonies; and the Thurians, whose lawgiver he was, according to Diodorus, were a mixture indeed of several nations, but principally Attic. Diodorus says, that Lampon and Xenocritus, both of Athens, were κτισταὶ, the *founders*, of Thurii;[t] and that when the Sybarites sent to Sparta and Athens to desire a colony, the Spartans refused them; but the Athenians undertook it,

[s] Lysias c. Pancleonem.

[t] Diod. p. 77, 78.

giving leave to any of the Peloponnesians to share with them if they pleased. Plutarch also ascribes the colony to the Athenians,[u] and names one Hiero an Athenian for the founder.[v] Dionysius Halicarn. attributes it *to the Athenians, and the rest of Greece*,[w] making the Athenians to be the principal. 'Tis true, indeed, Scymnus Chius makes Thurii a colony of the Achæans;[x] but this can hardly be true, unless we understand it of Sybaris, which was afterwards called Thurii; for that indeed was an Achæan colony. Diodorus adds, that at Olymp. LXXXVI. 3., ten years after the first settlement, the Thurians debated whose colony they were, and who should be called their founder.[y] The Athenians claimed it, because the *greatest* number of inhabitants[z] came from Athens; but those of Peloponnesus opposed it, because *many* came from thence too. At last they agreed to send to Delphi, that the oracle might determine the point; and they were answered, that Apollo himself was to be counted their founder: and so the matter ended, no nation pretending to that honour. But however, that the Athenians had the greatest party and strongest interest there appears doubly; both because, in the Athenian invasion of Sicily, the Thurians adhered to the Athenians against the Sicilians and Spartans,[a] and because the Thurian money had a Pallas's head with a helmet, exactly like the Attic.[b] I am not ignorant that, after the defeat of the Athenians in Sicily, Ol. XCI. 4., the Thurians too, among the rest of their confederates, deserted them, and CCC. Athenians were banished from the colony.[c] But the laws of Charondas, as Diodorus relates, were made upon the first establishment there, above XXX. years before that overthrow: and I leave it to the reader's judgment if at that time the great number and power of the Athenians at Thurii do not make it more

[u] Plut. V. Lysiæ and V. Periclis.
[v] Idem, V. Niciæ.
[w] Dionys. V. Lysiæ.
[x] Scymnus, v. 325. [p. 19. *G. V. Ox.* ii.—D.]
[y] Diod. p. 93.
[z] Πλείστους οἰκήτορας.
[a] Thucyd., Diodor.
[b] Goltzius.
[c] Dionys., and Plutarch. V. Lysiæ.

probable that their laws, if then made, would have been in the Attic dialect, rather than the Doric.

VIII. There's a very odd passage in Stephanus Byzantius;[d] *Ἀπὸ τῆς Κατάνης Χαρώνδας, ὁ διάσημος τῶν ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι νομοθετῶν, of Catana was Charondas, that celebrated lawgiver at Athens:* and another in Suidas,* more odd than that; *Νομοθέται παρ' Ἀθηναίοις πρῶτος ἐγένετο Δράκων, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτον Σόλων, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτον Θαλῆς, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτον Αἰσχύλος, the lawgivers to the Athenians were first Draco, then Solon, then Thales, and then Æschylus.* What

[d] Steph. v. Κατ.

[* In v. Νομοθέται.

Wesseling in his Preface to Petiti *Leges Atticæ*, having quoted this passage of Suidas, proceeds thus: "Ubi sanè quam præter opinionem accidit, in "Atticarum legum auctoribus Thaletem et Æschylum, de quo utroque nihil "hujusmodi veterum commentarii, censeri: quod pulchrè perspectum cùm "haberet singulari vir eruditione R. Bentleius, exturbato ex Suidâ Æschylo "substituit Ζάλευκον, positâque post primam vocem majore interpunctione, "Grammatici verba vertit, *Legislatores. Primus apud Athenienses fuit Dracon, "post eum Solon: tum Thales, post quem Zaleucus.* Sic quidem legum latoribus "Thales et Zaleucus aggregabuntur, etsi Athenis nullas dederint, sicuti factum "à Dracone et Solone fuerat, sed utroque posteriores. Zaleucus Locrensibus "dictavit leges, in Cretâ Thales floruit, Zaleuci, uti prodidit memoriæ Aris-"toteles (Politic. L. ii. 12.), præceptor: antiquissimi ambo, verùm errore "quodam post Draconem et Solonem collocati, quòd Suidas et is, quem exscrip-"sit, Thaletem eum domo Milesium putarent. Hæc vir doctissimus, Thaletem "et Æschylum rectè in ordinem cogens, de Suidâ tamen non optimè meritus. "Hausit is ex iisdem fontibus, unde hæc Cedreni (Compendii Histor. p. 67. *ed. "Venet.*) profluxerunt: *Ἐν τούτοις τοῖς ἄρχουσιν ἐνομοθέτει Ἀθηναίων πρῶτος Δρά-"κων ὀνόματι. μετ' αὐτὸν δὲ Σόλων τοῦ Δράκοντος τοὺς νόμους ἠτέθει. εἶτα* ΘΑΛΗΣ "Ο ΜΙΛΗΣΙΟΣ *ἐθεσμοθέτει, καὶ πάλιν* ΑΙΣΧΥΛΟΣ. Hinc unicuivis apertum est, "non posse è Suidâ *Αἰσχύλον* tolli. Designatur enim is Æschylus, qui Archontum "perpetuorum fuit penultimus, Alcmæonis decessor, quod Jo. Malala (Chrono-"graphiæ p. 87. *ed. Oxon.*) Cedreno eâ in re paria faciens, dissertissimè adfirmat. "*Ἐν δὲ τοῖς χρόνοις τῶν ἀρχόντων ἐνομοθέτει Ἀθηναίων πρῶτος ὀνόματι Δράκων, "καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν Σόλων, καὶ ἔλυσε τοὺς νόμους Δράκοντος Σόλων. καὶ πάλιν ἐνομο-"θέτησε* ΘΑΛΗΣ Ο ΜΙΛΗΣΙΟΣ, *καὶ πάλιν ἐβασίλευσε πρῶτος* ΑΙΣΧΥΛΟΣ, *καὶ "μετ' Αἰσχύλον ἐβασίλευσεν αὐτῶν Ἀλκμαίων.* Jam Æschylo illo et Alcmæone "Dracon, Solon et Milesius Thales plurimis annis cùm sint seriores, liquidis-"simè pellucet nugacissimorum scriptorum error, uberiore confutatione indig-"nus. Præstiterit eum potiùs tangere, quo Charondas in numerum legum "latorum, qui Athenis illustri nominis famâ floruerunt, additur. *Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς*

shall we say to these passages? We must own there were many *νομοθέται*, *makers of laws*, at Athens after Solon's time; but yet I can hardly believe that Charondas, and Thales, and Æschylus, are to be reckoned of that number. As for Suidas, I am persuaded that for *Αἰσχύλος* the true reading is *Ζάλευκος*: so that, putting a full stop after *νομοθέται*, as it is in the paragraph just before, the meaning of Suidas will be thus: LAWGIVERS. *The first was Draco at Athens; after him Solon, after him Thales, after him Zaleucus.* Where he does not assert that Thales and Zaleucus were Athenian lawgivers, but only that their laws were more recent than Draco's and Solon's. We have seen already from Aristotle,[d] how some maintained that Zaleucus was Thales's scholar, meaning Thales the Cretan, who was

" *Κατάνης*, Stephani Byzantini (in *Κατάνη*) verba sunt, ΧΑΡΩΝΔΑΣ, *ὁ δή-*
" *σημος τῶν ἐν Ἀθήνησι νομοθετῶν.* Cui sententiæ quis auctor idoneus? quis
" fundus? Thurinis, seu veriùs Chalcidicæ originis per Siciliam atque Italiam
" civitatibus Charondam leges scripsisse, Plato, Aristoteles et magno numero
" alii testes sunt. De Atheniensibus nusquam id proditum legitur. Cane-
" bantur sanè Athenis Charondæ leges inter pocula nonnunquam. *Πίδωτο*
" *Ἀθήνησι καὶ οἱ Χαρώνδου νόμοι παρ' οἶνον*, quemadmodum ex Hermippi L. vi.
" *περὶ Νομοθετῶν* memorat Athenæus (Deipnosoph. L. xiv. p. 619). Id eas
" inter cives aliquo in honore fuisse, nec tamen in foro receptas, nedum Athe-
" niensibus leges à Charondâ latas, declarat. Quid itaque Stephano fiet? Viri
" eruditissimi R. Bentleius et Jo. Alb. Fabricius, ut peccati culpam ab eo quàm
" longissimè amolirentur, alter *ἐν Σικελίᾳ*, alter (Biblioth. Gr. L. ii. 14, 6.) *ἐν*
" *Κατάναις*, scriptum primitùs fuisse suspicabantur, labemque aut ab Hermolao
" aut aliis amanuensibus progenitam. Neutrum, pace eorum dixerim, placet,
" quippe arbitrarium prorsùs, omnique veterum librorum patrocinio defectum:
" quam ob rem illam etiam conjecturam, quæ mihi olim in mentem venerat,
" *τῶν ἐν Αἴτνῃ*, probare non possum. Nam tametsi Catanam labentibus annis
" *Αἴτνην* adpellatam fuisse constat, caussa exputari non potest justa, cur Ætnæ
" potiùs legislatorem, quàm Catanæ aut alterius ex Chalcidicis civitatibus Cha-
" rondam perhibere maluerit: præsertim cùm *Ætnæ* illud cognomen multis
" annis legislatore sit recentius, urbi (Diodorus Siculus L. xi. p. 267.) ab Hie-
" rone inditum. Maneat ergo priva hæc Stephano opinio, sive ea nata sit, quòd
" Charondas Thuriis, Atheniensium colonis leges promulgâsse, quæ Fabricii
" opinio, ferretur, sive aliâ ex caussâ. Quis enim omnia errorum cubilia certo
" pede vestiget? Hoc quidem certè sine cujusquam injuriâ tutò asseveratur,
" deesse illis locupletem scriptorum veterum auctoritatem, quibus Atheniensium
" legis latoribus Thaletem Milesium, Æschylum, et Charondam transcribere
" placuit." p. ii. iii.—D.]

[d] See here, p. 381.

almost CCC. years before Solon's time: but Suidas, or his author, confounding Thales the Cretan with the philosopher Thales the Milesian, has by consequence put him after Solon. This perhaps may be no unlikely account of the passage of Suidas: but the other of Stephanus is very hard to make out. For even Plato and Aristotle forbid us to allow of the vulgar reading, ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι; for, speaking of this Charondas,* they make him lawgiver in some towns of Sicily and Italy, but say not one word of his laws at Athens. Add to this, that ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι, which all the editions and MSS. seem to agree in, is not Greek: for they ever say Ἀθήνῃσι, without the preposition; as they will find who please to examine it.† These things seem to warrant a conjecture, that Hermolaus, the epitomiser of Stephanus, or some of his copiers, mistook, and put ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι for ἐν Σικελίᾳ. And yet, on the other side, that Charondas's laws were famous at least, if not in force, at Athens, we have a good authority; Hermippus, in his treatise *Of Lawgivers*, who informs us, *that Charondas's laws used to be sung at Athens over a glass of wine*, ᾖδοντο Ἀθήνῃσιν οἱ Χαρώνδου νόμοι παρ' οἶνον.[e] For the very title of the book shews that *NOMOI* here do not signify *songs and tunes*, as Ὀλύμπου νόμοι, Μαρσύου νόμοι, but really *laws*. Now, Aristotle puts a problem, *Why are tunes called νόμοι?*[f] and he answers, *Is it, because, before the use of letters, men* SUNG *their laws, that they might not forget them? as the custom continues yet among the Agathyrsi.* Which passage I think will go a great way towards putting an end to our debate about Charondas. For if laws were *sung* before the knowledge of

[* See here, p. 403.—The reference in the old ed. is imperfect—thus, "P. . . ."—D.]

[† "They do indeed say ἐν Ἀθήναις: see p. 206. [256.]: ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι seems "to have crept into use in later times. See examples in Bast. Ep. Crit. p. 189. "and Wyttenbach (on Plutarch, S. N. V. p. 16.) there quoted. These two "learned men should, however, have left out the instances from Herodotus." DOBREE, *Advers.* ii. 366.—D.]

[e] Athen. p. 619. [=V. 242. *ed. Schw.*—D.] Ἑρμιππος ἐν ἕκτῳ περὶ νομοθετῶν.

[f] Arist. Prob. xix. 28.

letters, as Aristotle says; and if Charondas's laws were *sung* at Athens, as Hermippus says; then the consequence seems fair and natural, that they were first sung at Athens, before the date of Solon's or Draco's laws, which were *written* upon wooden tables, and fixed up for the public view. And by this account, Charondas's laws must be sung CC. years before the very naming of Thurii. Besides this, we may justly infer that his laws were written in some sort of verse or tuneable measure; for otherwise how they should be *sung* over wine, I do not understand. And, to confirm us in this suspicion, there's a passage in Strabo, of which his learned commentator has said nothing; but from this view it will be plain and easy. *The Mazacenes of Cappadocia*, says he, *use the laws of Charondas, αἱρούμενοι καὶ νομῳδὸν, and appoint some person to be their* LAW-SINGER, *who is among them the declarer of the laws, as the lawyers are among the Romans.*[g] Now, how comes it to pass that Charondas's laws required a *law-singer*, *ΝΟΜΩΔΟΣ*, a word and office never heard of but in this passage of Strabo? Unless there were something peculiar in them; that whereas other laws were in prose, they were in verse, and to be *sung* by the people. To give an instance how they might be sung at Athens; one of the laws of Charondas, as Diodorus says, was *περὶ τῆς κακομιλίας, about avoiding ill company*:[h] now, the Athenians had a scolion, or catch, which they used to sing *παρ' οἶνον*, over a glass of wine;[i]

Ἀδμήτου λόγον, ὦ 'ταῖρε, μαθὼν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς φίλει·
Τῶν δειλῶν δ' ἀπέχου, γνοὺς ὅτι δειλῶν ὀλίγη χάρις.

The measure of it is neglected in the vulgar Athenæus, but it's like that in Alcæus and Horace;

Nullam, Vare, sacrâ vite priùs severis arborem.[*]

[g] Strabo, p. 539. [h] Diod. p. 79.

[i] Arist., and Schol. p. 356. [*Vesp.* v. 1238. *ed. Bekk.*, and *Schol.* p. 176.—D.] Athen. p. 695. [=V. 542. *ed. Schw.*, where in the first line *ἀγαθοὺς σέβου*, and in the second *ὅτι δειλοῖς*.—D.]

[* *Carm.* I. xviii.—D.]

Μηδὲν ἄλλο φυτεύσῃς πρότερον δένδρεον ἀμπέλῳ.[*]

Now if, instead of *Ἀδμήτου λόγον*, one should say thus,

Χαρώνδου νόμον, ὦ 'ταῖρε, μαθὼν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς φίλει,

he would have the very law that Diodorus speaks of, *about evil conversation.* But we have one of his laws really extant in verse, though not of Charondas's own making, but of one of the comic poets;[j]

Τὸν νομοθέτην φασὶ Χαρώνδαν ἔν τινι
Νομοθεσίᾳ τά τ' ἄλλα καὶ ταυτὶ λέγειν·
Ὁ παισὶν αὐτοῦ μητρυιὰν ἐπεισάγων,
Μήτ' εὐδοκιμείσθω, μήτε μετεχέτω λόγου
Παρὰ τοῖς πολίταις, ὡς ἐπείσακτον κακὸν
Κατὰ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ πραγμάτων πεπορισμένος.
Εἴτ' ἐπέτυχες γάρ, φησι, γήμας τὸ πρότερον,
Εὐημερῶν κατάπαυσον· εἴτ' οὐκ ἐπέτυχες,
Μανικὸν τὸ πεῖραν δευτέρας λαβεῖν πάλιν.

So these iambics are to be read in Diodorus. In the common editions the two first verses are taken for prose, and supposed to be Diodorus's words, not the poet's. But it's now evident that they belong to the rest, and I have only changed *ταῦτα* into *ταυτὶ* for the sake of the measure. Even the great Grotius[k] was in the common mistake, and believed them to be prose; and upon that account he altered the VIIth verse thus,

Εἴτ' ἐπέτυχες γὰρ τὸ πρότερον γήμας, φίλε:

because, I suppose, he could not apprehend what *φησί* belonged to; but now it's plain that it refers to Charondas. In the last verse both the editors of Diodorus and Grotius too admit of the vulgar reading, *πείρας δευτέρας*, *the second*

[* *Athen.* IV. 75. *ed. Schw.*, where *Μηθὲν, κ. τ. λ.*—D.]
[j] Diod. p. 80. [= I. 487. *ed. Wessel.*—D.]
[k] Grotii Excerpta ex Trag. et Com. p. 919.

experiment; but at that rate it is not true Greek, for λαβεῖν here will not bear a genitive case. I have corrected it, therefore, πεῖραν δευτέρας, *the experiment of a second wife.* Well, if it appear probable, from these several particulars, that Charondas's laws were drawn up in some kind of verse, or measure, fit to be sung, we need no other proof to detect the imposture of Stobæus's writer. For all the fragments that are produced there are flat and downright prose, without the least footsteps of poetical measure. For example, this very law which we have now cited from the comic poet is thus expressed in Stobæus;[1] Ὁ μητρυιὰν ἐπιγαμῶν μὴ εὐδοξείτω· ἀλλ' ὀνειδιζέσθω, ὥσπερ αἴτιος ὢν οἰκείας διαστάσεως; *he that marries a second wife, to be stepmother to his children, let him be disgraced, as being the author of his own disquiet.* This law the writer might meet with in the poet cited above, or some other author now lost, and therefore he inserted it into his collection, to make the cheat pass the more easily. But I appeal to those that are skilled in the ancient poetry, if there be any musical measure, of any sort whatsoever, in the words that he has given us. He seems to have heard too that Charondas's laws were used to be sung, as we have shewn from Hermippus and Strabo: he concludes therefore with this; Προστάσσει δὲ ὁ νόμος, ἐπίστασθαι τὰ προοίμια τοὺς πολίτας ἅπαντας, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς μετὰ τοὺς παιᾶνας λέγειν ᾧ ἂν προστάσσει ὁ ἑστιάτωρ, ἵνα ἐμφυσιοῦται ἑκάστῳ τὰ παραγγέλματα; *the law enjoins that all the citizens shall learn these proœmia; and at their feasts, some person appointed by the master of the feast shall say them, after the hymns are sung, that the laws may become familiar to every body.* He is so far in the right, indeed, that these laws that he has put upon us are to be *said,* and not *sung;* for there's nothing of harmony in them, nor do they need a *law-singer,* νομῳδὸς, as the true laws of Charondas did; nor would the Athenians have *sung* these παρ' οἶνον, at their merriments, for the very laws of

[1] Stob. Serm. xlii.

Solon have as much of tune and verse in them. But the sagacious reader may observe too a very odd and peculiar usage of the word ἐμφυσιοῦται, which this writer puts here to signify *being natural, as it were, and familiar*. And, that we may not think it a fault of the copier, there's the same word in the page before; Ἐμφυσιοῦται ἑκάστῳ τὸ κάλλιστον καὶ σπερματωδέστατον τῆς ἀρετῆς, *that the best and the most seminal virtue may become natural to them:* though in both places even common syntax requires that we should read it ἐμφυσιῶται. Now, in all the authors that I can think of it has quite another meaning, *to be puffed up, and be proud*, from φυσάω, *to blow:* but this mock Charondas believed it came from φύσις, *nature*, which is mere barbarism; for the first syllable of φύσις is short, and the first of φυσιόω long. This, with some other words, both in Charondas and Zaleucus, and the matter too of each of them, makes me suspect the author was no native of Greece: but I do not pretend to determine that; neither do I assert any thing positively on either side of this whole debate about the two lawgivers. I rather desire to stand a neuter, till the matter shall be decided by some abler hand: and, if I might have the nomination, it should be he whom the whole learned world will allow to be the best able, his Excellency Mr. Ezekiel Spanhemius.[m]

I return now to our learned Examiner, and I find him still at his old work of cavilling and mistaking. He has spent

[m] [See note * p. 404.—D.]

After this was committed to the press, I recollected a passage of Laërtius, which at that time was quite out of my mind. This author tells us, from Heraclides Ponticus, *that Protagoras the Sophist was lawgiver to the Thurians.* Ἡρακλείδης, says he, ὁ Ποντικὸς.... Θουρίοις νόμους γράψαι φησὶ Πρωταγόραν τὸν Ἀβδηρίτην. (Laërt. in Protag.) [where φησὶν αὐτὸν.—D.] The same author tells us that *Protagoras flourished* κατὰ τὴν τετάρτην καὶ ὀγδοηκοστὴν Ὀλυμπιάδα, at Ol. LXXXIV., the very time that the Athenian colony went to Thurii. It's very probable he was then at Athens, for he was twice there: his second coming was between Olymp. LXXXIX. 1. and LXXXIX. 3., as Athenæus proves, p. 219. [= II. 339. *ed. Schw.*—D.] This, as I take it, is a great confirmation of what I have said about the spurious Charondas. [*Adden.*]

two miserable pages (p. 45, 46.) in ridiculing me, as he thinks, for saying Empedocles wrote an *epic poem;* a name which he thinks belongs to no poems but such as the *Ilias* and *Æneis*. What will he say, then, to Athenæus, who calls Archestratus's *Gastronomia*, a small poem about fish and cookery, an EPIC POEM: ἐπικὸν δὲ, says he, τὸ ποίημα?[n] What to Quintilian, who among (EPICOS) *the epics* reckons Aratus, Theocritus, Nicander?[o] Is not Empedocles as much an *epic* as these are? What will he say to Laërtius, Plutarch, and others, who usually say Parmenides's ἔπη, and Xenophanes's ἐποποιΐαν, and the Pythagorean's χρυσᾶ ἔπη? What to Suidas, who says Orpheus wrote ὠοθυτικὰ ἐπικῶς; and Timotheus about *quadrupeds, birds, fishes*, &c. ἐπικῶς; and Tribonianus upon *Ptolemy's Canon* ἐπικῶς? Are not these poems *philosophical*, as well as Empedocles's? But what will he say to Aristotle,[p] Plutarch,[q] and Simplicius,[r] who expressly call Empedocles's poems *ΕΠΗ*? For, pray, what difference between ἔπη or ἐποποιΐα, and ποίημα ἐπικόν? Athenæus plainly shews us that they have all the same importance; for the same poem of Archestratus, which in one place he calls ἐπικὸν ποίημα, in another[s] he calls ἐποποιΐαν, and in a third[t] he calls the author ἐποποιός. But let us see Mr. B.'s happy address in managing this cavil. *If the Dr.*, says he, *has met with an account of Empedocles's writing an epic poem, he knows more of his works than Laërtius did, who was so absurd as to pass it over in silence* (p. 45). A noble paragraph indeed to come from such a master of sense and style. If Laërtius *did not know* of that epic poem, how was he *absurd* in not speaking of it? Mr. B. may please to explain this, who at least is answerable for the language of his book. But his Assistant, perhaps, *that consulted books for him* (Pref.), is to blame here for the

[n] Athen. p. 4. [=I. 16. *ed. Schw.*—D.]
[o] Quint. x. 1.
[p] Arist. Nicom. vii. 3.
[q] Plut. de Aud. Poët.
[r] Simplic. ad Phys. Arist. p. 7. and 258.
[s] P. 104. [=I. 404. *ed. Schw.*—D.]
[t] P. 335. [=III. 237. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

matter; and the next time that Mr. B. sees him, he may justly call him to account for deceiving him about Laërtius. For that author reckons up among other poems of Empedocles's, *ΞΕΡΞΟΥ ΔΙΑΒΑΣΙΣ, the Expedition of Xerxes*,[u] which he afterwards calls *ΠΕΡΣΙΚΑ*. And I dare appeal to Mr. B. himself, if that was not an *epic* poem in his own sense of the word. 'Tis true, Laërtius adds, that Empedocles's sister is reported to have burned that poem. But that's nothing to the present point; for Mr. B. challenges me to produce any voucher for Empedocles's *writing* an epic poem; and that I have now done. Nay, if Aristotle's copies do not deceive us, that *epic* poem was extant in his time,[v] for he quotes a fragment of it,

Ἄλφιτον ὕδατι κολλήσας—

But I own that for *Περσικοῖς* I would there read *Φυσικοῖς*, as others have done before me; because the very same fragment is quoted by him, in another place,[w] out of *Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἐν τοῖς Φυσικοῖς*: and the very sense of it, *a paste made of meal and water*, shews it rather belongs to *physics* than to the Expedition of Xerxes.

But can the Dr. be so wretchedly ignorant, says Mr. B., *as to think every large copy of hexameters is an epic poem?* (p. 45.) On whose side the *wretched ignorance* lies, the present age and posterity will judge. But it's plain Mr. B. supposes that Empedocles's *Physics* were but a *large copy of verses*. And yet Laërtius would have taught him that those *Physics* consisted of 5000 verses; which are above twice as many as are in all Virgil's *Georgics*. Nay, they were divided into several books; and Simplicius cites the FIRST and SECOND of them; *Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἐν πρώτῳ τῶν Φυσικῶν*[x] *Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἐν δευτέρῳ τῶν Φυσικῶν*.[y] Mr. B. seems to

[u] Laërt. Emped.
[v] Arist. Probl. xxi. 22. *Ἐμπεδοκλῆς . . . ἐν τοῖς Περσικοῖς.*
[w] Meteor. IV. 4.
[x] Simplic. Phys. Arist. p. 34.
[y] P. 86.

have as false a notion of Empedocles's *ΚΑΘΑΡΜΟΙ*, treatise of *Expiations;* for he compares it with Theocritus's *Pharmaceutria* (p. 46, 47), as if they resembled one another both in bigness and in subject. Now, the one has but 166 verses in it; and the other, as Laërtius says, had 5000: is not Mr. B., then, very exact in this first way of comparison? As for the subject of them, the *Pharmaceutria* of Theocritus is nothing but the charms and philtres of a woman to make a man in love with her; and what is that to *Καθαρμοὶ, the Expiations,* of Empedocles? which were either the lustrations of cities and countries from plagues, earthquakes, prodigies, or of private persons from diseases, dreams, murders; or rather (if Mr. B. say true, *that the subject of that treatise was in great measure drawn from the Pythagoreans,* p. 47.) the *Καθαρμοὶ* must signify the purification of the mind in the Pythagorean way, which Hierocles, Jamblichus, and others, speak so much of. Mr. B. goes on, *that we have a large fragment of his, directed to the people of Agrigent his townsmen; so that the subject was no higher than an account of himself to his own countrymen: and may not Doric, then, be proper for little poems, where men of ordinary rank are addressed to?* Here he supposes this fragment to be a different piece from the *Καθαρμοὶ,* being a *little poem,* says he, to the Agrigentines: whereas Laërtius twice tells us that the fragment is out of the *Καθαρμοὶ,* the beginning of which work was thus,

> *Ὦ φίλοι, οἳ μέγα ἄστυ κατὰ ξανθοῦ Ἀκράγαντος*
> *Ναίετε**——

So that a book of 5000 verses is again dwindled into a *little poem.* And then to infer from the first verses of it, *that the subject of the whole was nothing but an account of himself to his countrymen,* is just as if he should argue from the first verses of the *Georgics,* that the subject of them is nothing but Virgil's account of himself to Mæcenas.

[* Laërt. in *Emped.* I. 528. *ed. Meib.*—D.]

To shew that Phalaris's *Epistles* might be writ in Doric at first, but afterwards be *translated*, he instances in the pieces of Perictyone, and Aristoxenus, and Zaleucus, three Pythagoreans, *who in all probability wrote in Doric; and yet in Stobæus's time some part of the writings of the one were in Ionic, and those of the others in the common dialect* (p. 53). Now, as for his king Zaleucus, I have endeavoured to shew above that he was no Pythagorean, and that the writings ascribed to him are a cheat: and the second writer, Aristoxenus, was at first indeed a scholar to Xenophilus, a Pythagorean, and wrote the lives of Pythagoras and his followers, but he was afterwards Aristotle's scholar; neither did he reckon himself among the Pythagoreans, as appears from Laërtius and Diodorus. *The last of the Pythagoreans*, says Laërtius,[z] *were Xenophilus and five others, whom Aristoxenus saw*. And Diodorus[a] places *τῶν Πυθαγορικῶν φιλοσόφων τοὺς τελευταίους, the last of the Pythagorean sect*, at Olymp. CIII. 3., which was XLIV. years before Aristotle's death, whom Aristoxenus expected to have succeeded, but Theophrastus was preferred before him. Why should Aristoxenus, then, write in Doric, who both lived at Athens, and was no Pythagorean? Mr. B.'s third writer is Perictyone, *who, though a Pythagorean, writ in Ionic*. Mr. B. declares more than once that he despises the mean employment of *index-hunting;* but his Assistant and he, as we have seen in several instances, are not always of the same opinion. For the hint of this Ionic fragment of Perictyone was taken out of Stobæus's index: but if he had read the author, and not dipped into the index only, he would have found in the very first chapter two fragments of Perictyone's book *περὶ Σοφίας*, and both of them in the Doric. The Ionic fragment is spurious, therefore; for why should she write philosophy in two dialects? Nay, to deal freely and openly, I believe all her fragments are spurious, as most of those of Pythagoric treatises are justly suspected to be; for they appeared but late in the world, and long after the times of their pretended

[z] Laërt. in Pyth. [a] Diod. p. 386.

authors. Porphyry, in his MS. Commentary upon Ptolemy's *Harmonics* (which I am glad to hear the very excellent Dr. WALLIS is now publishing at Oxford), cites a passage of Archytas the Pythagorean; *Οὗ μάλιστα*, says he, *καὶ γνήσια εἶναι λέγεται τὰ συγγράμματα*,* *whose writings in particular are supposed to be genuine.* Few of the rest will be thought so in the judgment of knowing persons; and particularly this Perictyone will be exploded for a mere forgery. For who ever heard before of this Pythagorean lady? Jamblichus has given us a list of all the women of the sect that he ever heard of, and there's no such among them. Stobæus is the only man that mentions her, or her writings; and I am persuaded that the forger of them designed to have them pass in the name of that Perictyone who was Plato's mother. For they thought it a point of decorum to make even the female kindred of philosophers copy after the men. So, in the counterfeit *Socratic Epistles*, we have Socrates's wife Myrto setting up an academy for the ladies. And among the Pythagoric writings we have a book *About Human Nature*,[b] *Αἰσάρας Πυθαγόρου Λευκάνας*, which the learned Canterus translates *Aresæ Pythag.* He seems to take it for Aresas, one of the successors of Pythagoras; but the true version is thus, *Æsaræ Pythagoræ F. Lucanæ, by Æsara, Pythagoras's daughter, the Lucanian.* And yet neither Jamblichus, nor Porphyry, nor Laërtius, when they give us an account of that philosopher's daughters, take any notice of Æsara. But there's a late author in Photius that mentions her, though the passage† is so corrupted, that the lady is lost in't. *The sons of Pythagoras*, says he, *were Mnesarchus and Telauges; καὶ Σάρα καὶ Μυία αἱ θυγατέρες, and Sara and Myia his daughters.* Correct it, *καὶ Αἰσάρα*; the syllable *Αι* was lost here, because the same in *ΚΑΙ* preceded it: so that henceforward they may register

[* Wallis's *Opera Mathem.* III. 236. fol. 1699, in which this piece of Porphyry was first printed.—Wallis had published Ptolemy's *Harmonics*, 4to. 1682.—D.]

[b] Stob. Eclog. Phys. p. 105.

[† Phot. *Bibl.* CCLIX. [CCXLIX.] p. 1314. *ed.* 1653.—D.]

this Æsara in the list of the Pythagorean women, and blot out Sara, whom nobody ever heard of.

I must now consider half-a-dozen of Mr. B.'s pages by the lump (p. 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60). A very learned person,* in excuse for the Attic dialect of Phalaris, had objected to me, *that Ocellus the Lucanian, though a Dorian by his country, had not written in Doric, as appeared by his book yet extant, De Naturâ Universi.*[c] Now, when I was drawing up the former edition of this *Dissertation*, I observed Stobæus[d] quoted some passages of Ocellus in Doric, which are extant word for word in the present book, the dialect only altered; whereby I knew the whole treatise was writ originally in the Doric dialect. I can truly say I observed this myself, without knowing that any other had done it before me. And I was induced to think that nobody had done 't, from this very objection about Ocellus Lucanus, which was made by a man of very great reading, and yet plainly implies that he had no where met with the observation. And I was confirmed further in the belief of it from the Cambridge edition of Ocellus, which was the only one I had then by me; for the first annotation printed there is a question, *Why, since Archytas, and Timæus Locrus, and Theocritus, wrote in the Doric idiom, Ocellus should write in Attic?* to which no answer at all is given. Were not these things enough to persuade one that the observation had not been made before? I must confess I was not ignorant that one Vizzanius had set out an edition of Ocellus; but being an editor of no great esteem (the Editor of Phalaris must pardon this freedom), I had not purchased the book, nor knew at all that he had said this thing before me: neither did I think it worth the while to let the press stand still while I sought for it, because I knew the Cambridge edition was later than Vizzanius's, and would probably have had the observation in it, if Vizzanius had lit upon't. Besides that I was prone enough to believe that the learned Greek pro-

[* Joshua Barnes.—D.]

[c] Euripid. ed. Cantab. tom. ii. p. 523.

[d] Stob. Phys. c. 24.

fessor, the author of the objection, could not be a stranger to Vizzanius's edition; so that I concluded, from his not knowing it, that Vizzanius had not said it. This is a true account of this matter about Ocellus Lucanus; and I hope it is so fair a one, that all ingenuous persons, not tinged with envy and malice, will be satisfied with it. I shall now make some remarks on the Examiner's harangue, wherein he has laboured to make the world believe that I stole the observation, which I gave out for my own, out of Vizzanius's Preface. Which being about matter of fact, and within the reach of my own knowledge, I do aver to be a calumny, and that the account I have here given is true in every part of it. But let us see how he makes out his indictment. *He finds the same places in Stobæus named by Vizzanius and me; therefore I stole the observation from him* (p. 57). Wonderfully argued! But are not those passages in Stobæus the only ground that the observation is bottomed on? If two persons, therefore, without concerting together, might hit upon the observation, which I presume Mr. B. will not deny, is it not necessary that they must both hit upon those proofs which the observation solely depends on? If I had concurred with Vizzanius in some incidental matters not at all necessary to the main point, it might then look a little more probable that I had pillaged them from him; but since the observation in general might be found out without Vizzanius's help, the citing of such places as it's entirely founded on is no further proof that I made use of his help. But Mr. B. argues further: *that the Dr. says it was agreed and covenanted among the scholars of that Italian sect φωνῇ χρῆσθαι τῇ πατρῴᾳ,*[e] *to use their own* MOTHER-TONGUE; *which,* says he, *he* FOUND *in Vizzanius, who says the* SAME *thing, and quotes the same authority for it: Tum quia Pythagoræos quoslibet Doricæ dialecto studuisse comperio; tum quia id Pythagoræ suadeant instituta, qui semper idiomatum Græcorum Doricum maximè voluit sectari;*[f] i. e. *all the Pythagoreans used the* DORIC,

[e] Jamblich. Vit. Pyth. p. 202.

[f] Vizzan. Præf.

according to Pythagoras's institution, who preferred that dialect before all the rest, as Jamblichus says (p. 55). Now, to see the acuteness of our Examiner; he has brought here such an argument to shew me a *plagiary*, as is a manifest proof that I am none. For how could I *find* that in Vizzanius which is not in him? and how does he say the *same* thing who says the very contrary? The thing, as I said it, is thus; the Pythagoreans enjoined all the Greeks that entered themselves into the society to use every man his *mother-tongue*:[f] Ocellus therefore, being a Dorian of Lucania, must have writ in the Doric. This I took to be Jamblichus's meaning. But Vizzanius has represented it thus; that they enjoined all that came to them to use the *mother-tongue* of Crotona, which was the Doric. Now, this is quite contrary to what I make it. For if an Athenian or an Ionian had listed himself among them, they must both have spoken Doric, according to Vizzanius; but in my interpretation they must each have retained his own country dialect. Whether Vizzanius or I have hit upon the true meaning of Jamblichus, perhaps all competent readers will not be of a mind;* but I dare say they will unanimously agree in this, that Mr. B., though he would prove me a *plagiary*, has taken such effectual care that nobody will ever be a plagiary from him.

[f] Jamb. *Φωνῇ χρῆσθαι τῇ πατρῴᾳ ἑκάστοις παρήγγελλον, ὅσοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων προσῆλθον πρὸς τὴν κοινωνίαν ταύτην· τὸ γὰρ ξενίζειν οὐκ ἐδοκίμαζον.*

[* That the interpretation of Vizzanius is the true one is proved by Bp. Warburton, Div. Leg. p. 120. vol. i. ed. 2. Jamblichus in the same place says that Pythagoras valued the Doric above the other Greek dialects. In another place he assigns this for one of the causes of the decay of the Pythagoric philosophy, viz. *διὰ τὸ καὶ τὰ γεγραμμένα Δωρίδι γεγράφθαι.* p. 49. ed. Kust. *Note on ed.* 1777.—" Warburton, *Divine Legation*, ii. 3. and *Letters to Hurd*, p. 10. " 8vo. allows that Jamblichus's words, *without reference to the context*, naturally " give Bentley's meaning; but that *with* such reference they must mean what " Vizzanius makes them mean. Hence he concludes that Bentley, having only " seen the detached sentence, *as quoted in Vizzanius*, understood it in a way " which he afterwards discovered to be wrong, when he looked into Jamblichus " himself. This precious hypothesis is destroyed by the single fact, that Viz- " zanius does not quote the words, but only refers to the passage.—N. B. " Vizzanius, Amst. 1661, is an exact reprint of ed. Bononiæ, 1646." DOBREE, *Advers.* ii. 366.—D.]

But I had said, *if a man had published a book not in his mother-tongue, he had been banished the society. Which is an inference*, says Mr. B., *that Vizzanius did not make* (p. 55). How then *have I taken all, word for word, out of his Preface?* (p. 54.) But Mr. B. gives four reasons why Vizzanius did not make the inference. First, *because this injunction was not observed by Empedocles.* Have I not justly observed once before, that there's a sort of fatality in Mr. B.'s errors? Could he possibly have brought an instance more directly against himself? For Empedocles was really turned out of the society for writing that book that Mr. B. refers to; and a law was made upon't,[g] that no epic poet from that time should be admitted into the company. Secondly, he says, *the author of the Golden Verses wrote not in Doric;* and yet was not expelled the society. But can Mr. B. prove that the society was in being when those Verses were first made? We are sure Pythagoras was not the author of them, but we know not who was. And I believe no mention is made of them till above c. years after the extinction of that society. Much weaker, therefore, is Mr. B.'s third reason, *that Jamblichus, even while he is writing this account of the Pythagoreans, did not observe the injunction.* For Jamblichus was a Platonic, and not a Pythagorean; and the society had been dissolved above [illegible] years before his time. The fourth is, *that Pythagoras himself did not observe this injunction;* for an epistle of his is in Ionic. True, indeed, Pythagoras did not observe it, as Vizzanius explains the injunction; but as I have done it, he did observe it, for his φωνὴ πατρῴα, *mother-tongue,* was Ionic, he being a native of Samos. Besides this, I might tell Mr. B. that the epistle is spurious: so that every way this last instance is worthy of his wit and learning.

There are yet one or two cavils about this business of Vizzanius, which I cannot let pass without an answer. He says, *the scarcity of Vizzanius's book, and the probability of not being traced, encouraged the Dr. to pillage from him*

[g] Laërt. Emped.

(p. 138.); which is spoken with so much sense and truth, that the very contrary may be fairly concluded from 't. For how is his edition so scarce, that has been twice printed within fifty years, and may be purchased at a small value? And where could I expect to be more easily traced than here, if I had really stolen from him? The discovery that I thought I was the first author of was about Ocellus Lucanus; and would not any person that was minded to sift it, first of all look into the editions of Ocellus? Certainly, if I was disposed to be a plagiary, I would steal with a little more discretion; and not pretend to tell news of Ocellus, out of the common editions of him. And, without question, there was no improbability of my *being traced;* since it appears that the Examiner was able to trace me. But I had said, *if I may expect thanks for the discovery, I dare engage to make out that Ocellus wrote in Doric.* This, by a just and candid reader, would be thought to imply, that I believed the discovery scarce worthy of thanks: but Mr. B. would not slip the opportunity of shewing his good-nature, and his ability at farce and banter, so that he discovers in the expression *an extraordinary air of satisfaction* (p. 54). And yet this air is not quite so discernible as that of Mr. B.'s a little before, when, having offered at a slight correction of Strabo, *Ἀκράγας Γελῶων ἄποικος*, for the vulgar reading *Ἀκράγας Ἰώνων*; which Casaubon and Cluverius, who knew well enough that Agrigentum was a colony of the Geloans, had let pass as an error of the author's, not of the copiers', because in some other accounts of the Sicilian colonies, as well as in this, that author differs from all the rest: the Examiner, I say, admiring and pluming himself for that glorious emendation, *I wonder*, says he, *how this escaped the most learned and acute Casaubon's observation* (p. 51). Now, here's an *air* of suspicion, that these fine epithets were sprinkled here upon Casaubon to elevate somebody the higher, and to hint to us that he was *as learned and more acute than he.* But, for my own part, I am so far from valuing myself upon a discovery of Ocellus's Doric, that I

have expunged it out of this second edition; though it was as really my own discovery as if nobody had hit on't before me. Such a discovery is but a business of chance, or at the best of bare industry, neither is there any sagacity or judgment required to it; and it has so little of difficulty, that not only Vizzanius, but even the Editor of Phalaris, might easily have stumbled on't.

I have run through the Examiner's authorities which he has produced on this head: let us now take a short view of his reasonings. The result of what he has said about poets that changed their country dialect is this; *that they chose such a dialect as was then in fashion when they wrote. For there was a fashion in dialects, and the chief of them had severally their course and period in which they flourished* (p. 42). Now, I must frankly acknowledge, that, let Phalaris, or Æsop, or whoever you will, be spurious, this reasoning is a genuine piece, and the Examiner's own; for it carries his peculiar mark and signature upon it, in that it proves directly against himself. For it's so far from being an account why Phalaris should use the Attic dialect, that it's almost a demonstration that he would not have used it. Because in the time of the true Phalaris the Attic dialect was not yet in fashion; there was no Attic prose then besides Draco's and Solon's laws; and but one piece or two in verse. I had expressly urged this against the *Epistles*, that *Phalaris would not write Attic; especially since, in those early times, before stage-poetry, and philosophy, and history, had made it famous over Greece, that dialect was no more valued than any of the rest.*[h] Where it is not only intimated that there was a *fashion* of dialects, but the very causes are assigned that brought the Attic into fashion. Phalaris, therefore, would never forsake his own native tongue for the Attic, at a time when neither stage-poet, nor philosopher, nor historian, had writ in't.

But the Examiner has come off worse, if possible, in his

[h] See here, p. 355.

account of prose writers that exchanged their native dialect for some other. For Dionysius Halicarnassensis, though he was born in a Doric country, yet lived in another, and in the age of Augustus, when the Attic idiom had been famous for CCCC. years. What's this, then, to Phalaris's case, who never stirred, that we know of, out of Sicily, and lived at a time when the Attics were as unlearned as their neighbours? We may apply the same, with a little allowance, to his other prose authors. But he should have instanced in familiar epistles, never intended for public view, such as Phalaris's are, and shewed that even in those cases men have deserted their own dialect; and this had been something to the purpose. But he'll tell us he has not been wanting here; for, *to come closer to the point*, says he, *we have a letter of Dion of Syracuse to Dionysius the Tyrant, and a piece of one of Dionysius's, both preserved among Plato's Epistles, and written in such a dialect as if both prince and philosopher* (*to use the Dr.'s phrase*) *had gone to school at Athens* (p. 43). Here he fancied he was very smart upon me; but, as it generally happens with him, he lashes himself. For, to use the Examiner's phrase, the *philosopher* did really go to school at Athens, and lived with Plato and Speusippus: and though the *prince* did not go to Athens, yet Athens, as I may say, went to him; for not Plato only, but several other philosophers, were entertained by him at his court in Syracuse.

But, to shew Mr. B. what a difference there is between poems, or philosophical or historical tracts, designed for the public, and private letters about family affairs, never intended to be sent abroad, and that an argument about the dialect must not be drawn from the one to the other, I'll give him an instance in one of his own list, Epimenides the Cretan. Mr. B. would prove, out of St. Paul, that this Cretan's poems were not in Doric; but, though his argument failed him, I supplied him with a better, which plainly shews they were in Ionic. Neither will I, upon account of this Ionicism, impeach those poems as supposititious, because in those days it was the fashionable dialect for all *epic*

poetry. For, as Hermogenes observes, *the Ionic is sweet and naturally poetical, ποιητικὴ φύσει καὶ ἡδεῖα.*[i] But if Mr. B. should produce a private letter of this Epimenides not written in the Cretan language, then the case would be quite altered; for the letter I should tax as a cheat, though I did not the poem; and I have a great example to warrant me in't. *There's an epistle goes abroad,* says Laërtius, *of Epimenides to Solon, about the form of government that Minos gave to the Cretans; but Demetrius the Magnesian endeavours to prove it spurious, because it is not written in the Cretan dialect, but in the Attic.*[j] Mr. B. may see, by this instance, that the inference will not hold from poems to epistles. For I hope he'll allow this Demetrius to be a competent judge here. He was Cicero's preceptor in rhetoric, an acquaintance of Pomponius Atticus, and an excellent critic and historian. And if he thought it an absurdity for a Cretan to write Attic letters, though directed to an Athenian, how much more absurd may we think it in Phalaris, a Sicilian, to write Attic epistles to other Sicilians? There's another letter of Epimenides to Solon,[k] which is truly in the Cretan or Doric idiom; but, for all that, I shall not believe it genuine. For one forger may be more skilful than another: and one of the most ignorant of them all is the mock *Sicilian prince.*

[i] Hermog. p. 315. [j] Laërt. in Epimen. [k] Laërt.

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY ROBSON, LEVEY, AND FRANKLYN,
46 St. Martin's Lane.

par. pers. auff 262-3

lxiv
96
90
261